Al-Ḥusayn Ibn ᶜAlī: A Study of his Uprising and Death Based on Classical Arabic Sources (3rd and 4th Century A.H./9th and 10th Century A.D.).

Riadh Ahmad
Institute of Islamic Studies
McGill University
Montréal, Canada
November, 2006

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

© Riadh Ahmad, April 2007

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Library and Archives Canada

Published Heritage Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et Archives Canada

Direction du Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-32128-7
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-32128-7

NOTICE:
The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:
L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ABSTRACT

This dissertation deals with al-Ḥusayn's uprising and death based on the classical Arabic sources. It is argued that al-Ḥusayn's uprising and opposition to Yazīd's caliphate were directly connected to the matter of the caliphate and the caliph's qualifications. He refused to recognize Yazīd's caliphate because he considered it as illegitimate due to the fact that Yazīd was not qualified to assume such an important office. It is also argued that because of Muᶜāwiya, who attempted to secure Yazīd's succession by forcing all Muslims to pay homage to him, Yazīd became caliph. Wanting to remove the real meaning of the caliphate and intending to transform it to a kingship (*mulk*) inherited among his offspring, Muᶜāwiya himself rejected the principle of the early Companions of the Prophet by choosing the caliph.

Al-Ḥusayn refused to listen to those who advised him to submit to the established authority (de facto) and to enter into whatever the community had entered into and agreed upon. Yazīd's caliphate, in al-Ḥusayn's eyes, was a deviation from the Sunna of the Prophet and the conduct of the Rightly Guided Caliphs, and represented corruption in the community of his grandfather. As the Prophet's grandson, he believed that he was committed to following in the footsteps of his grandfather and was more responsible than anybody else for preventing corruption. Even when he became convinced of the Kūfans' failure to stand with him, al-Ḥusayn refused to give the *bayᶜa* to Yazīd and also felt obliged to revolt against him. Furthermore and apart of his strategy, he did decide to take his family with him in order that they would play a significant role after his death.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Amongst the results obtained during this research were the three different patterns of writing in our sources; namely, pro-Sunnī, pro-Shīᶜī and a moderate, who escaped being classified as pro-Sunnī or pro-Shīᶜī.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

RÉSUMÉ

Ce mémoire est une étude de la révolte et mort de al-Ḥusayn qui se base sure les sources arabes classiques. Nous proposons que la révolte de al-Ḥusayn et son opposition au califate de Yazīd sont étroitement liées à l'institution du califat et aux conditions que le calife devait remplir. Il a refusé de reconnaître le califat de Yazīd, le considérant illégitime, puisque Yazīd n'avait pas les compétences pour occuper la charge d'un devoir aussi important. Nous proposons d'ailleurs que c'est à cause du califate de Muᶜāwiya, qui, lui a tenté d'imposer la succession de Yazīd en obligeant les Musulmans à lui rendre hommage, que Yazīd est devenu calife. Puisqu'il voulait se débarrasser du vrai sens du califat et avait l'intention de transformer cette function en une royauté héritée par sa progéniture, Muᶜāwiya, lui, a rejeté les principes des premiers Compagnons du Prophète en choisissant ainsi le calife.

Al-Ḥusayn s'obstinait à suivre les conseils de ceux qui voulainent qu'il se soumette à l'autorité officielle (*de facto*) et se plie à ce que la communauté de Musulmans avait accepté. Le califat de Yazīd, aux yeux de al-Ḥusayn, n'était qu'une dérogation de la Sunna du Prophète et la conduite des quatre (Califes bien Guidés), et représentait une corruption dans la communatuté de son grand-père. En tant que petit-fils du Prophète, il croyait qu'il était obligé de suivre la conduite de son grand-père et qu'il était plus responsible que personne d'autre pour combattre la corruption. Même quand il s'est aperçu que les gens de Kūfa n'allainent pas l'appuyer, al-Ḥusayn s'est obstiné à donner la *bayᶜa* à Yazīd se sentait obligé de se révolter contre lui. De plus, une autre stratégie qu'il

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

s'est proposé était de garder sa famille avec lui car ils pouvaient témoigner de sa tragédie après sa mort.

Les résultats obtenus pendant cette recherche démontrent qu'il y a trois types de positions représnetees dans nos sources: la positions Sunnite, le position chiitte, et une position moderee, ni Sunnite, ni chiite.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT i

RÉSUMÉ iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS v

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS vi

NOTES ON TRANSLITERATION vii

INTRODUCTION 1

Sources of this study 11

CHAPTER ONE: HISTORICAL BAKGROUND

Part One: The Abdication of al-Ḥasan 38

Part Two: The Significant of Ḥujr's Protest 62

CHAPTER TWO

Part One: Muᶜāwiya's attempts to Secure Yazīd's Accession 81

Part Two: Yazīd's Demand for Allegiance 114

CHAPTER THREE

Part One: Ibn ᶜAqīl's Mission 133

Part Two: Al-Ḥusayn's Route to Kūfa 156

Part Three: The Murder of al-Ḥusayn 182

CHAPTER FOUR: The Role of the Captives After al-Ḥusayn's Murder 204

CONCLUSION 226

BIBLIOGRAPHY 239

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My supervisors Dr. Donald Little and Dr. Uner Turgay offered both advice and encouragement. I am grateful to Dr. Little and appreciate his help and advice. His corrections and comments were invaluable to me during the research.

I am infinitely grateful to my supervisor Dr. Turgay. To him I owe enormously since I had first applied for my Master's degree at McGill. I sincerely appreciate his kind and advice. His encouragement, guidance and recommendations were immense help to me. I will never forget his assistance and support. To Dr. Turgay I would like to extend my utmost gratitude and sincere thanks.

My deepest appreciation goes to Ms. Heather Empey, who not only edited and corrected my thesis, but also provided me with many helpful suggestions. I am obliged to Ms. Ann Yaxley and Ms. Kirsty Mckinon for their sincere and continuous help. I would like to extend my appreciation to the Library Staff of the Institute of Islamic Studies especially Ms. Salwa Ferahian, Public Services Librarian, for her encouragement and generous help.

The completion of this study would not have been possible without the help of my wife. I will never forget her support and patience during the difficult times in my study.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

NOTES ON TRANSLITERATION

The system of transliteration of Arabic terms and phrases follows the style adopted by the Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University. The transliteration of the feminine ending *tā' marbūṭa* is rendered as {a} where it is not pronounced, in words such as *sunna*. The respective *hijrī* and Christian dates are separated by an oblique. If only one date is mentioned, it refers to the common era. The word ibn has been always capitalized as Ibn.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Al-Ḥusayn Ibn ᶜAlī: A Study of his Uprising and Death Based on Classical Arabic Sources (3rd and 4th Century A.H./9th and 10th Century A.D.).

INTRODUCTION

Al-Ḥusayn Ibn ᶜAlī (d. 61/680), grandson of the Prophet Muḥammad and third Imām of the Shīᶜa, was born in Medina in the fourth year A.H.[1] He was brutally killed on the plains of Karbalā', in Iraq, on the tenth day of the Muslim month Muḥarram along with the male members of his family and a group of his followers, at the hands of the Umayyad authorities. The only reason for al-Ḥusayn's killing was that he refused to acknowledge Yazīd (d. 64/683) as caliph after Muᶜāwiya's death (60/680).

The reasons for al-Ḥusayn's refusal to acknowledge Yazīd's claim to the caliphate were twofold: 1) that Yazīd was not qualified for such a sacred office and, 2) that he, al-Ḥusayn, belonged to the family of the Prophet and, as such, would not pay homage to an impious man like Yazīd. Al-Ḥusayn himself explained his opposition to Yazīd's caliphate by stating:

> We are the household of the Prophet, frequented by angels and are the heart of the descent of divine mercy. Yazīd, on the other hand, is a reprobate, a drinker of wine and a killer of the innocent and openly practices all means of corruption. A man of my status, therefore, cannot give *bayᶜa* (homage) to a man like Yazīd.[2]

---

[1] Muḥsin al-Amīn, *Aᶜyān al-Shīᶜa*, 10 vols. Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1406/1986, 1: 578. Muḥammad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Nuᶜmān al-Mufīd, *al-Irshād*, 2 vols. Qum: Mu'assasat Āl al-Bayt, 1413/1993, 2: 27.
[2] Aḥmad Ibn Aᶜtham al-Kūfī, *Kitāb al-Futūḥ*, 4 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ᶜIlmiyya, 1406/1986, 3: 14.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

In this thesis, it will be argued that al-Ḥusayn's uprising and his opposition to Yazīd's caliphate were directly connected to the nature of the caliphate and the caliph's qualifications. The cornerstone of al-Ḥusayn's uprising and his consequent fate was that he refused to acknowledge Yazīd's caliphate when the latter threatened him to do so or be killed. Al-Ḥusayn's refusal of Yazīd's caliphate was not based on personal reasons, rather it was based on religious grounds; he believed that Yazīd was not qualified for the caliphate, and that he, al-Ḥusayn, was more entitled to it because of his merits and his relationship to the Prophet.

In order to understand al-Ḥusayn's uprising, it is essential to deal with the following questions: On what bases was the caliphate after the Prophet Muḥammad (d. 11/632) established? What were the qualifications of the Rightly Guided Caliphs (*al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidūn*)? What were the opinions of ᶜAlī and his sons, al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn, in regard to the caliphate, on the one hand, and the opinion of Muᶜāwiya and his son, on the other?

The caliphate, after the death of the Prophet Muḥammad and until ᶜAlī's death (40/661), was based on three foundations: 1) early merits (*sābiqa*) and service in the cause of Islam (*faḍīla*) were the criteria for the choice of the caliph;[3] 2) the caliph should

[3] These merits are, for instance: migration with the Prophet from Mecca to Medina, participating in the Battle of Badr, the Battle of Uḥud, etc. In his argument with the helpers (*al-Anṣār*), Abū Bakr (d. 13/634) contended that the immigrants (*al-Muhājirūn*) were more entitled to the caliphate than the *Anṣār* because of their virtues and early merits in Islam. Muḥammad Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh al-Umam wal-Mulūk*, 8 vols. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Aᶜlamī lil-Maṭbūᶜāt, 1403/1983, 2: 457. Abū ᶜUbayda b. al-Jarrāḥ (d. 18/639) believed that Abū Bakr was the best of the *Muhājirūn* and had merits in Islam, and because of Abū Bakr's merits, he paid homage to him. Ibid., p. 458. A similar account is attributed to ᶜUmar (d. 23/644) as well. ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma wal-Siyāsa*, 2 vols, Qum: Manshūrāt al-Raḍī, 1388/1969, 1: 26. According to Ibn Qutayba and al-Ṭabarī, before he swore allegiance to Abū Bakr, ᶜAlī mentioned his *sābiqa* and *faḍīla*. Ibid., p. 33. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 448. Before his death, Abū Bakr transferred the caliphate to ᶜUmar and told the people that he was transferring the caliphate to a person who was the best among them. Ibid., p. 253. Before his death, ᶜUmar wanted to transfer the caliphate to one of the Companions who had merits in Islam and whose conduct the Prophet was satisfied with. Ibid., p. 570. ᶜUmar also nominated six

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

follow the Book of Allāh (al-Qur'ān) and the conduct, Sunna, of the Prophet; otherwise the people were not obliged to submit to him;[4] and 3) the caliphate could not be established and the caliph could not be acknowledged as legitimate unless the people paid homage to him. In fact, the *bayᶜa* was the cornerstone of the caliphate and without it the caliph could not be accepted by the Muslims and they had no obligation to submit to him unless they swore allegiance to him. The Muslims deemed the *bayᶜa* as a covenant (*ᶜahd*) between them and the caliph which could not be dissolved unless the caliph deviates from acting according to the Book of God and the Sunna of the Prophet.[5]

Although they adhered to the conditions of the caliphate mentioned above, ᶜAlī and his sons, al-Ḥasan (d. 50/670) and al-Ḥusayn, believed that they were more entitled to the caliphate than anybody else because of their close relationship to the Prophet.[6] They were

---

persons for the caliphate only because of their merits and their leading position among the Muslims. Ibid,. p. 602. According to Ibn Qutayba, ᶜUmar explained that he nominated these six because the Prophet was satisfied with their conduct. *Al-Imāma*, 1: 42. ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn ᶜAwf (d. 32/652-3) admitted that both ᶜAlī and ᶜUthmān (d. 35/655) had *sābiqa* and merits in Islam and, consequently, were entitled to the caliphate. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 604. See also Aḥmad Ibn Yaḥyā al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, 13 vols. ed. Suhayl Zakkār and Riyāḍ Zarkalī, Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1417/1996. 3: 25, 278.

[4] When Abū Bakr became caliph, he told the people that they should obey him only if he followed in the footsteps of the Prophet; otherwise, they did not have to submit to him. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 450. When ᶜUmar became caliph, he announced that he was going to follow the right path, the Qur'ān and the Sunna of the Prophet. Ibid., p. 456. After ᶜUmar's death, ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn ᶜAwf, who was to be followed by the Muslims in his decision to nominate the caliph, according to ᶜUmar's will, told both ᶜAlī and ᶜUthmān that he would pay homage to them only on the condition that they should follow the Book of Allāh, the Sunna of the Prophet, and the conduct of Abū Bakr and ᶜUmar. Ibid., pp. 609-10. Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 45.

[5] For this reason, al-Ḥusayn, when he was asked to revolt against Muᶜāwiya after the truce between al-Ḥasan and Muᶜāwiya in 41/661, declined stating "We paid allegiance to him [Muᶜāwiya], and, therefore, we cannot dissolve our *bayᶜa*." Aḥmad Ibn Dāwūd al-Dīnawarī, *al-Akhbār al-Ṭiwāl*, Qum: Maṭbaᶜat al-Amīr, 1408/1988, p. 203. Ibn Qutayba narrates that when Fāṭima (d. 11/632), Alī's wife and the daughter of the Prophet, demanded from the helpers that they pay homage to ᶜAlī, they told her that if ᶜAlī had come to them before Abū Bakr they would have paid homage to him, but since they already paid homage to Abū Bakr they could not dissolve it. Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 29-30. For the significance of the role of the *bayᶜa* among the Arabs and the Muslims, see Muḥammad Mahdī Shams al-Dīn, *Niẓām al-Ḥukm wal-Idāra fīl-Islām*, Qum: Dār al-Thaqāfa, 1412/1992. p. 48, 70.

[6] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 604, 608. Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 11. Although ᶜAlī admitted Abū Bakr's merits in Islam, he argued that he was more entitled to the caliphate than him because of his close relationship to the Prophet. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 3: 295-6. See also, Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 28-9, 32. According to al-Balādhurī, ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn ᶜAbbās (d. 68/697) asked ᶜUmar to nominate ᶜAlī as his successor because of his relationship to the Prophet and his merits and virtues in Islam. *Ansāb*, 6: 120-1. After ᶜAlī's assassination, Qays Ibn Saᶜd Ibn ᶜUbāda (d. 60/679) described to the Kūfans his merits in Islam and his relationship to the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

also of the opinion that they were the guardians of the principles of the caliphate, the conduct of the Prophet and the principles of Islam.[7]

Since Muᶜāwiya Ibn Abī Sufyān had witnessed the events of the caliphate after the Prophet's death, he was not unaware of the conditions of the caliphate and the qualifications of the caliph, and had also realized that he himself lacked these qualifications. He belonged to the former enemies of the Prophet who converted under duress at the time of the Muslim conquest of Mecca. Muᶜāwiya was *ṭalīq*, one of those pardoned and released by the Prophet at the time of the conquest of Mecca, and did not have the status of *muhājir* (one who had made the migration from Mecca to Medina), and, therefore, had no right to the caliphate because he lacked early merits in Islam.[8] For this reason, Muᶜāwiya did not contest ᶜAlī's entitlement to the caliphate, rather, he announced that he refused to swear allegiance to ᶜAlī because he was seeking to avenge his kinsman ᶜUthmān's murder, and for that reason only the Syrians swore allegiance to him.[9]

Prophet and encouraged them to swear allegiance to his son, al-Ḥasan, who, according to Qays, was entitled to the caliphate because of his merits and his relationship to the Prophet. Ibid., 3: 278, 279. On the occasion of his accession to the caliphate (40/660), al-Ḥasan addressed the people of Kūfa. In his speech, he emphasized that he was more qualified for this office due to his merits. He also praised the virtues of the family of the Prophet and his close relationship to the Prophet. Ibid., p. 279. Abū al-Faraj al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil al-Ṭālibiyyīn*, Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Aᶜlamī, 1407/1987, p. 62.

[7] Ibid. Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1:12. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 279. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 608.

[8] Khalīfa Ibn Khayyāṭ, *Ta'rīkh*, ed. Suhayl Zakkār, Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1414/1993, p. 160. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 341. ᶜAlī Ibn Muḥammad al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj al-Dhahab*, 2 vols. Qum: Manshūrāt Dār al-Hijra, 1404/1984, 2: 372. Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1:93. Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, p. 65.

[9] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 66, 103. Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 99, 122. According to al-Balādhurī and Ibn Qutayba, when Muᶜāwiya refused to pay homage to ᶜAlī the people of Syria pledged allegiance to Muᶜāwiya as an *amīr* not as a caliph. *Ansāb*, 3: 82,103. *Al-Imāma*, 1: 99. Al-Balādhurī narrates that when Muᶜāwiya decided to fight ᶜAlī, a man called ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān asked Muᶜāwiya for the reason he was fighting ᶜAlī since he, Muᶜāwiya, lacked ᶜAlī's merits and relationship to the Prophet. In response, Muᶜāwiya admitted ᶜAlī's merits and his relationship to the Prophet but declared that he was fighting him only to avenge ᶜUthmān's killing. *Ansāb*, 3: 66, 73, 103. Al-Balādhurī also relates that Abū Mūsā al-Ashᶜarī (d. 50/670-1), a prominent companion of the Prophet, refused to pay homage to Muᶜāwiya because he lacked the qualifications to be caliph. When he was asked by ᶜAmr Ibn al-ᶜĀṣ (d. 42/662), who praised Muᶜāwiya for his ability in politics and administration, about his refusal to swear allegiance to Muᶜāwiya, Abū Mūsā answered that ability in politics and administration was not a criterion of the caliphate; rather, the caliphate was restricted exclusively to the people of piety and priority (*faḍl*). Ibid., p. 124.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

It was only after the end of the battle of Ṣiffīn (37/657), in the last months of ᶜAlī's caliphate, that Muᶜāwiya made many expeditions into the territories under ᶜAlī's rule and tried to force their inhabitants to swear allegiance to him.[10] Muᶜāwiya realized that he could not challenge ᶜAlī for his entitlement to the caliphate and that he, Muᶜāwiya, had no right to it; therefore, he tried his best to demand the *bayᶜa* from the people, which was the only means he could resort to in order to be recognized as caliph. Once the people swore allegiance to Muᶜāwiya, his caliphate would be binding on them, and afterwards they could no longer dissolve their *bayᶜa*; this was to become a key strategy of Muᶜāwiya's.

After ᶜAlī's assassination, the people of Kūfa paid homage to al-Ḥasan because of his merits in the cause of Islam and his relationship to the Prophet.[11] Muᶜāwiya refused to acknowledge al-Ḥasan's caliphate and tried to assume it for himself. Muᶜāwiya, however, did not base his arguments for the caliphate on the principle of *sābiqa* and early merits in Islam, which had been recognized by the Rightly Guided Caliphs and the early Companions of the Prophet as the criteria for choosing of the successors to the Prophet. Rather, he claimed that the criteria for leadership of the community should be based on worldly abilities, efficiency in controlling and leading subjects, ability in politics and administration, the ability to expand the empire and skill in defending Muslims, and that therefore, he was more qualified for the caliphate than al-Ḥasan.[12]

In order to make al-Ḥasan abdicate his caliphate and impose the *bayᶜa* on the people of Kūfa, Muᶜāwiya utilized many devices, as will be described in the thesis. After al-

---

[10] Ibn Aᶜtham al-Kūfī, *Futūḥ*, 2: 103-7, 215-36. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 225-33. Aḥmad Ibn Abī Yaᶜqūb, better known as al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Taʾrīkh al-Yaᶜqūbī*, 2 vols. Beirut: Sādir, n.d. 2: 196-7. Khalīfa Ibn Khayyāṭ, *Taʾrīkh*, p. 150. During his expeditions, Muᶜāwiya instructed the commanders of his armies to assault the inhabitants of the territories and force them to pay homage to him.

[11] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 278. Al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 4: 121. Al-Hasan adopted Islam while he was young and he was one of the members of the family of the Prophet on their behalf some verses was revealed. Also on his special attitude many statements were uttered by the Prophet.

[12] Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, pp. 66-7. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 280

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Ḥasan's abdication, the people of Kūfa paid homage to Muᶜāwiya unwillingly.[13] Although al-Ḥusayn was resistant to accepting al-Ḥasan's abdication and did not recognize Muᶜāwiya's right to the caliphate, he followed his brother's orders and swore allegiance to Muᶜāwiya reluctantly.[14]

Not only had Muᶜāwiya deviated from the conduct of the Rightly Guided Caliphs in regard to the criteria for choosing the caliph, but he was also trying to transform the caliphate into a kingship which would be inherited by his offspring. Therefore, he tried his utmost to pass on the caliphate to his son Yazīd, who also lacked the necessary qualifications. In addition, Yazīd was well-known for his wrong-doings and his deviations from Islamic norms, and, therefore, was in no way entitled to the caliphate. Although Muᶜāwiya, before his death, tried to secure Yazīd's accession and force the people of Mecca and Medina to swear allegiance to him,[15] some of the prominent elites, whose support was crucial to Muᶜāwiya, refused to recognize Yazīd's caliphate. The most important of these nobles was al-Ḥusayn, because of his leading position, especially among the people of Kūfa.

When Yazīd became caliph, (60/680) he ordered his governor in Medina, al-Walīd Ibn ᶜUqba (d. 61/681), to compel al-Ḥusayn to pay homage to him and to accept no excuse if he would not comply. Al-Ḥusayn refused to recognize Yazīd's caliphate. Realizing that he could not stay in Medina unless he swore allegiance to Yazīd or otherwise face a perilous fate, al-Ḥusayn fled to Mecca seeking refuge there. When this

[13] Ibid., 3: 290. Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 217.

[14] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 293. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 203. According to Ibn Aᶜtham, al-Ḥusayn refused to pay homage to Muᶜāwiya. *Futūḥ*, 2: 297.

[15] The *bayᶜa* of the people of the two holy cities of Mecca and Medina (*al-Ḥaramayn*) was very important. Al-Balādhurī narrates, on the authority of Muᶜtamir Ibn Sulaymān, that the real *bayᶜa* is the *bayᶜa* of the people of *al-Ḥaramayn*. *Ansāb*, 3:9. Realizing the importance of the *bayᶜa* of the people of Mecca and Medina, Muᶜāwiya, in order to secure their allegiance to Yazīd, came in person to Medina and Mecca. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 339-42. Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 183, 188-9. Khalīfa, *Ta'rīkh*, p. 160.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

news reached the inhabitants of Kūfa, they wrote to al-Ḥusayn pressing him to come to Iraq and lead them against the Umayyad rulers. In response, he sent his cousin Muslim Ibn ᶜAqīl (d. 61/680) to the people of Kūfa as his emissary, to examine the situation and report back with assurances of their loyalty and readiness for his arrival. Ibn ᶜAqīl wrote a very optimistic letter to al-Ḥusayn, informing him of the success of his mission and sending him thousands of pledges signed by Kūfans urging him to come to them.

The supporters of the Umayyad regime in Kūfa, on the other hand, reported the latest developments to Yazīd and exhorted him to rescue Kūfa from Ibn ᶜAqīl. Yazīd, who no longer trusted the governor of Kūfa, al-Nuᶜmān Ibn Bashīr (d. 64/683), thereupon handed over control of Kūfa to ᶜUbayd Allāh Ibn Ziyād (d. 67/686), the then governor of Baṣra, ordering him to execute Ibn ᶜAqīl. Ibn Ziyād arrived in Kūfa in disguise and took effective measures that terrified Kūfa's inhabitants. Ibn ᶜAqīl's mission to control the situation in Kūfa failed and he was publicly executed by the new governor.[16]

Meanwhile, al-Ḥusayn, unaware of the recent turn of events in Kūfa, had set out from Mecca to join the people of Kūfa. Ibn Ziyād had stationed his troops on the roads leading from the Ḥijāz to Kūfa and had given orders forbidding all entry and departure. Parties of horsemen were scouring the region. On their way to Kūfa, al-Ḥusayn and his small group of followers were intercepted by a thousand horsemen under the command of al-Ḥurr Ibn Yazīd al-Riyāḥī (d. 61/680), sent by Ibn Ziyād. Al-Ḥurr prevented al-Ḥusayn from advancing towards Kūfa and forced him to stop at Karbalā', a place belonging to the district (*nāḥiya*) of Nīnawā. Ibn Ziyād sent for ᶜUmar Ibn Saᶜd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ (d. 66/685) to subdue the rebels. Refusing to comply with Ibn Ziyād's demands, al-Ḥusayn,

[16] Full details of these events with all sources related to them are mentioned to in Chapter three.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

his followers and most of the male members of his family went into battle and were killed. Al-Ḥusayn was the last to be killed. The decapitated heads were taken to Kūfa and then to Yazīd in Damascus.[17]

Al-Ḥusayn had left his grandfather's city, Medina, and taken up residence in Mecca, only because he refused to acknowledge Yazīd's caliphate. He left Mecca and decided to move to Kūfa when its inhabitants confirmed to him that they refused to acknowledge Yazīd's caliphate and urged him to lead them against the Umayyad régime. Al-Ḥusayn, the only living grandson of the Prophet at this time and the son of the fourth Rightly Guided Caliph ᶜAlī, declared openly that he, more than any other Muslim, was responsible for reviving the religion of his grandfather and saving Islamic principles from the corruption that had been committed by Yazīd. According to al-Ḥusayn, the caliph is endowed with the duty, particular to his status, of protecting Islamic laws from any violation. The Imām of the Muslim community is the one "who judges according to the book (Qur'ān) and the Sunna of the Prophet; dealing justly with people; devoting himself to the religion of truth (*dīn al-ḥaqq*); and restraining himself from all else but God."[18] Al-Ḥusayn describes the conduct of Yazīd and his followers by stating that these "people, following the footsteps of Satan, took away submission to God, disseminated corruption, and permitted what God forbade and forbade what God permitted." Al-Ḥusayn, as the grandson of the Prophet, therefore, believed that it was his responsibility to change this situation.[19]

---

[17] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūh*, 2: 35-67. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 262-285. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 416. Muḥammad Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal al-Ḥusayn min al-Qism Ghayr al-Maṭbūᶜ min Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*, ed. ᶜAbd al-ᶜAzīz al-Ṭabāṭabā'ī, Qum: Mu'assasat Āl al-Bayt, 1416/1996, p. 53, pp. 64-67.
[18] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 262.
[19] Ibid., 4: 304, Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 91. Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 171.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

What was the attitude of the people in regard to al-Ḥusayn's refusal to recognize Yazīd's caliphate and his movement against him? Aside from the supporters of the Umayyad government, who stood strongly with Yazīd and played a significant role in paving the way for him to defeat Ibn ᶜAqīl's mission in Kūfa and execute al-Ḥusayn, the people can be classified into four factions.

First, we have a group of prominent people who lived mainly in Mecca and Medina. Among them were Companions of the Prophet and sons of the Ṣaḥāba. They criticized Yazīd for his violation of Islamic norms and did not acknowledge his entitlement to the caliphate. They also admitted al-Ḥusayn's status and his close relationship to the Prophet. They predicted that al-Ḥusayn would be killed at the hands of the Umayyad authorities if he rose against Yazīd, and that this would cause damage to the Muslim community. Therefore, they were of the opinion that if al-Ḥusayn swore allegiance to Yazīd it would be better for the community than to revolt against him. They tried to persuade al-Ḥusayn not to comply with the call of the inhabitants of Kūfa.[20] Some of them believed that al-Ḥusayn should comply with whatever the community (*jamāᶜa*) agreed upon, and, therefore, recommended to al-Ḥusayn to stay in his home and pay homage to Yazīd.[21]

Second, we have a group of prominent leaders of the tribes in Kūfa called *ashrāf al-qabā'il*. They sent a letter to al-Ḥusayn while he was in Mecca, urging him to lead them against the Umayyad regime. Although they shared with al-Ḥusayn his opposition to the Umayyad officials, they were mostly looking out for their own interests. Their intention was to secure their positions and protect their property and the ties among their tribes. As soon as the new governor arrived and affairs in Kūfa had turned against Ibn ᶜAqīl, they

[20] Ibid., 3: 368. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 28. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 253.
[21] Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal al-Ḥusayn*, p. 57.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

changed their attitude and turned against al-Ḥusayn and his emissary. Their attitude was well described by a group of people, who, when questioned by al-Ḥusayn about the situation in Kūfa, informed him that the leaders of the tribes had been bribed to support Ibn Ziyād.[22] Moreover, the tribal leaders played a significant role in pressuring their tribes and the inhabitants of Kūfa to withdraw from Ibn ᶜAqīl's cause. They were also among the commanders of the Umayyad army who murdered al-Ḥusayn in Karbalā'.

Third, according to all our sources, we have the majority of the inhabitants of Kūfa and supporters of al-Ḥusayn, who had sent many letters urging him to lead them against the Umayyads. They refused to acknowledge Yazīd's caliphate and acknowledged al-Ḥusayn's status and his close relationship to the Prophet. They believed that al-Ḥusayn was more entitled to the caliphate than Yazīd. Although they were enthusiastic supporters of al-Ḥusayn's movement and swore allegiance to Ibn ᶜAqīl, they could not fulfill their promises to al-Ḥusayn. Because of the threats of the Umayyad officials, they withdrew from Ibn ᶜAqīl and remained in their homes out of fear. Al-Farazdaq (d. 110/728) described their attitude towards al-Ḥusayn by stating, "their hearts are with you, but their swords are against you."[23]

Fourth, we have a small group of al-Ḥusayn's supporters and followers who stood fast in their promises and sacrificed themselves for al-Ḥusayn.[24]

The killing of al-Ḥusayn became the prototype of Shīᶜī martyrdom and occupies a particularly important role in Shīᶜī piety. Shīᶜī communities regard the killing of al-Ḥusayn at the hands of the Umayyad authorities as an immoral massacre of the just and rightful ruler at the hands of an usurper. Thus, remembering al-Ḥusayn's death "combines

[22] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 382. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 306.
[23] Ibid., p. 290. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 80. Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 254.
[24] The names of the fourth group were recorded by some sources and have been discussed in Chapter Three.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

grief over his death with a strong condemnation of tyranny and injustice."[25] Al-Ḥusayn became a historical figure and " his death became a cosmic event, the central focus of human history."[26] The slogan "vengeance for al-Ḥusayn," which played a significant role in the downfall of the Umayyads, became a symbol for all future Shīᶜī movements.[27] Thus, one of the goals of this thesis will be to clarify the circumstances of his uprising and death.

Sources of this study

While much has been written about al-Ḥusayn's uprising and death, to the extent that it is extremely difficult to locate or even enumerate all these works, it is quite strange that no single historical study based on the classical Arabic sources has been compiled on the subject. Most of the writings on al-Ḥusayn's death are narratives and are based primarily on Shīᶜī sources. Some of them which carry the title *Maqtal al-Ḥusayn* (*The Killing of al-Ḥusayn*), focus exclusively on the tragedy of Karbalā'.[28] These works are not without exaggeration and generally reflect a Shīᶜī perspective. A substantial number are written in Persian. Murtaḍā Muṭahharī (d. 1399/1979), the famous Iranian scholar, dedicates a large part of his best-known piece, *al-Malḥama al-Ḥusayniyya*, to refuting some of these

---

[25] Peter Chelkowski, "Rawzah-Khavānī," *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1987, 12: 220. See also his "Taᶜziya: Indigenous Avant-Garde Theater of Iran," In *Taᶜziyah Ritual and Drama in Iran*. Edited by Peter Chelkowski, New York: New York University Press, 1979, pp. 1-11.

[26] Mahmoud Ayoub, *Redemptive Suffering in Islam: A Study of the Devotional Aspects of ᶜĀshūrā' in Twelver Shīᶜism*. New York: Mouton, 1978, p. 94.

[27] Sayyed Hossein Nasr, "Shiism: Ithnā ᶜAsharīya," *Encyclopedia of Religion*, 13: 262.

[28] Muḥammad Bāqir al-Maḥmūdī, in his book *ᶜAbarāt al-Muṣṭafayn*, 2 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Maḥajja al-Bayḍā', 1417/1997, 1: 6-7, enumerates the earlier works of the *Maqātil* literature from the 1st century to the 6th century. Theses works, however, are not extant. To take a glance at the nature of "*Maqtal al-Ḥusayn*" writings, see, for instance, Akhṭab Khawārizm, M*aqtal al-Ḥusayn*, 2 vols. Qum: Maktabat al-Mufīd, n.d.; ᶜAbd al-Razzāq al-Muqarram, *Maqtal al-Ḥusayn*, Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-Islāmī, 1399/1979; Muḥammad Taqī Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm, *Maqtal al-Ḥusayn*, Beirut: Dār al-Zahrā', 1405/1985; Muḥammad Ḥusayn Kāshif al-Ghiṭā', *Maqtal al-Ḥusayn*, ed. Hādī al-Hilālī, Qum: Intishārāt al-Sharīf al-Raḍī, 1419/1998.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Persian works,[29] while focusing on the philosophy of the social and religious aspects of al-Ḥusayn's uprising.[30]

Many modern works have been compiled on al-Ḥusayn by famous Shīᶜī scholars. Although these works deal mainly with al-Ḥusayn's life, his killing and its impact on the Muslim community, there are no clear attempts to analyze these events, particularly in regard to the classical Arabic sources that may depict the origin of reference, which is imperative for examining the authenticity of the reports.[31] In this respect, two works compiled by non-Shīᶜī scholars are worthy of being mentioned. One is by the famous Egyptian author ᶜAbbās Muḥmūd al-ᶜAqqād (d. 1383/1964), *Abū al-Shuhadā': al-Ḥusayn Ibn ᶜAlī*[32] and the other is by a religious Lebanese scholar ᶜAbd Allāh al-ᶜAlāylī (d. 1416/1996), *Al-Imām al-Ḥusayn: Sumuw al-Maᶜnā fī Sumuw al-Dhāt.*[33] Both writers focus on the religious motives of al-Ḥusayn's uprising and the philosophy and ideals of his deeds.

As for academic studies, relatively little has been compiled on al-Ḥusayn and his uprising. In this respect, we should mention two works. First is Mahmoud Ayoub's celebrated work, *Redemptive Suffering in Islam*, which focuses exclusively on the devotional aspects of the martyrdom of al-Ḥusayn. Referring to the Shīᶜī point of view,

---

[29] Murtaḍā Muṭahharī, *al-Malḥama al-Ḥusayniyya*, 3 vols. Qum: al-Markaz al-ᶜĀlamī lil-Dirāsāt al-Islāmiyya, 1413/1992; 1: 5-87, 3: 235-269.
[30] Ibid., 1: 137-259; 2: 5-259; 3: 163-231.
[31] See, for example, Muḥsin al-Amīn, *Aᶜyān al-Shīᶜa*, 1: 578-629; Bāqir Sharīf al-Qurashī, *Ḥayāt al-Imām al-Ḥusayn*, 3 vols. Qum: Intishārāt Madrasat al-Irawānī, 4th ed. 1413/1992; Hāshim Maᶜrūf al-Ḥasanī, *Sīrat al-A'imma al-Ithnay ᶜAshar*, 2 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Taᶜāruf lil-Maṭbūᶜāt, 1409/1989, 2: 7-105; Muḥammad Mahdī Shams al-Dīn, *Thawrat al-Ḥusayn: Ẓurufuhā al-Ijtimāᶜiyya wa Āthāruhā al-Insāniyya*, Beirut: Dār al-Taᶜāruf lil-Maṭbūᶜāt, 1401/1981, and, *Thawrat al-Ḥusayn fī al-Wijdān al-Shaᶜbī*, Beirut: al-Dār al-Islāmiyya, 1400/1980. Ibrāhīm Bauḍūn, *Thawrat al-Ḥusayn Ḥadathan wa-Ishkāliyyāt*, Beirut: Sharikat al-Maṭbūᶜāt lil-Tawzīᶜ wal-Nashr, 2001.
[32] ᶜAbbās Muḥmūd al-ᶜAqqād, *Abul-Shuhadā': al-Ḥusayn Ibn ᶜAlī*, Cairo: Dār al-Hilāl, n.d.
[33] ᶜAbd Allāh al-ᶜAlāylī, *Al-Imām al-Ḥusayn: Sumuw al-Maᶜnā fī Sumuw al-Dhāt*, Beirut: Dār Maktabat al-Tarbiya, 1986.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Ayoub notes that his purpose "will not be to document the historicity of any particular event of his [al-Ḥusayn's] life, nor to investigate the authenticity of anything that he may have said." Rather, his intention is "to look at his life from the point of view of popular devotion and deal primarily with the community's understanding of his life."[34] The second academic work, Ibrāhīm al-Ḥaydarī's *Trājīdyā Karbalā'*,[35] is a sociological study of the Shīᶜī practices and ceremonies in Iraq during the month of Muḥarram and makes no attempt to deal with the historical facts of the events. It should be noted that, in his two articles, "Rawzah-Khavānī," and "Taᶜziya," Peter Chelkowski focuses on the Shīᶜī ritual of public lamentation for al-Ḥusayn's murder, especially in Iran.[36]

Four historical works deserve special attention, although they do not focus exclusively on al-Ḥusayn. Two were compiled by Julius Wellhausen and the other two are by S.H.M. Jafri and Wilferd Madelung. In *al-Khawārij wal-Shīᶜa* (*The Religio-Political Factions In Early Islam*), Wellhausen relies mainly on the version of al-Ṭabarī, on the authority of Abū Mikhnaf (d. 157/773). It seems that Wellhausen was often influenced by al-Ṭabarī in narrating the details of the events. For example, Wellhausen relates many insignificant details about Muslim Ibn ᶜAqīl's mission, and his death.[37] On the other hand, certain important events, such as the dialogues between al-Ḥusayn's followers and the Umayyad authorities are dealt with quite sketchily.[38] Moreover, Wellhausen ignores Muᶜāwiya's attempts to secure homage for his son Yazīd. In my

---

[34] Ayoub, *Redemptive Suffering in Islam*, p. 16.
[35] Ibrāhīm al-Ḥaydarī, *Trājīdyā Karbalā'*, Beirut: Dār al-Sāqī, 1999.
[36] Peter Chelkowski, "Rawzah-Khavānī," *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, 12: 220-1, and "Taᶜziya," *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, 14: 358-9.
[37] Julius Wellhausen, *al-Khawārij wal-Shīᶜa* (*The Religio- Political Factions in Early Islam*). It should be mentioned that this book was translated into Arabic from the German version, *Die religiös-politishen Oppositions parteien im alten Islam*, tr. ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān Badawī, Kuwait: Wakālat al-Maṭbūᶜāt, 1976, p.122.
[38] Ibid., p. 124.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

thesis, I give considerable attention to the significance of these dialogues and also deal thoroughly with the importance of Muᶜāwiya's attempts to secure allegiance for Yazīd.

In his second book, *al-Dawla al-ᶜArabiyya wa Ṣuqūṭuhā* (*The Arab Kingdom and Its Fall*), Wellhausen again relies on al-Ṭabarī's account, although he also refers to *al-Kāmil fil-Ta'rīkh* by Ibn al-Athīr (d. 630/1233), who adds almost nothing to al-Ṭabarī's version. Referring to Ibn al-Athīr's version, Wellhausen wrongly believes that Muᶜāwiya's violent attitude in the Ḥijāz while attempting to secure support for his son Yazīd, was unknown in the early sources.[39] In dealing with the events concerning the abdication of al-Ḥasan and his truce with Muᶜāwiya, Wellhausen depends exclusively on al-Yaᶜqūbī, al-Dīnawarī and al-Ṭabarī.[40] In their versions, both al-Yaᶜqūbī and al-Dīnawarī, following their custom of summarizing events, do not provide comprehensive accounts of the circumstances surrounding al-Ḥasan's abdication in 41/661. In his narration, al-Ṭabarī depends exclusively on al-Zuhrī's reports and omits other accounts.[41] Perhaps he did so in order to avoid being classified as an ᶜAlid supporter.

Although Jafri compares different versions of al-Ḥasan's abdication in his book, *The Origins and Early Development of Shīᶜī Islam*, he never cites al-Balādhurī, Ibn Saᶜd or Ibn Aᶜtham among his references. In dealing with al-Ḥusayn's uprising and its consequences, Jafri relies mainly on al-Ṭabarī's version and pays little attention to other sources. Unlike his section on al-Ḥasan's abdication, Jafri here acknowledges various sources only briefly and does not compare different versions. He adopts Abū Mikhnaf's

---

[39] Wellhausen, *al-Dawla al-ᶜArabiyya wa-Ṣuqūṭuhā* (*The Arab Kingdom and Its Fall*). This book has been translated into Arabic from the German version, *Das Arabische Reich und sein Sturz*, tr. Muḥammad ᶜAbd al-Hādī, Cairo: Lajnat al-Ta'līf wal-Tarjama wal-Nashr, 1986, p. 138. In fact, this incident is narrated by many sources. See Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 339-348. Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma wal-Siyāsa*, 1: 182-191. Khalīfa Ibn Khayyāṭ, *Ta'rīkh Khalīfa Ibn Khayyāṭ*, pp. 160- 164.

[40] Wellhausen, *al-Dawla al-ᶜArabiyya*, pp. 99-106.

[41] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 121.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

version since he agrees with some scholars, such as Wellhausen and Sezgin, that "Abū Mikhnaf was generally the most reliable and authentic writer on the annals of Kūfa and Iraq under the Umayyads."[42] Jafri's main source for al-Ḥusayn is al-Ṭabarī since the latter used Abū Mikhnaf's work in full.[43] Following Veccia Vaglieri's finding that al-Balādhurī almost used the same sources as al-Ṭabarī, Jafri omits him.[44] In fact, some important accounts are provided by al-Balādhurī which are not recorded by al-Ṭabarī.[45] Because Ibn Kathīr (d. 774/1372-1373) accepts most of the material of Abū Mikhnaf, Jafri refers to him. For the same reason he cites al-Mufīd and al-Isfahānī.[46]

When Jafri deals with al-Ḥusayn he adopts a more narrative style and changes his historical approach. For instance, when considering the speeches of al-Ḥusayn's followers, Jafri uncovers the philosophy of martyrdom,[47] but pays scant attention to the stages of Muᶜāwiya's attempts to secure allegiance for Yazīd. For these important incidents, Jafri unfortunately depends on al-Ṭabarī and al-Masᶜūdī, who do not have complete or thorough accounts of Muᶜāwiya's endeavor to secure Yazīd's accession.[48] Although he occasionally provides a condensed account of pertinent events, such as the response of the nobles of Baṣra to al-Ḥusayn's call,[49] at times he ignores other important events, such as "al-Ḥusayn's will and testament to his brother, Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya (d. 81/700), and the dialogue between Muslim Ibn ᶜAqīl and Ibn Ziyād." All these key events are thoroughly discussed in my thesis.

---

[42] S.H.M. Jafri, *The Origins and Early Development of Shīʿī Islam*, London: Longman Group Ltd., 1979, p. 212.
[43] Ibid.
[44] Ibid., p. 213.
[45] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, 3: 366-7, 374, 390 and 5: 128-30.
[46] Jafri, *The Origins*, pp. 213, 215.
[47] Ibid., pp. 202-208.
[48] Ibid., pp. 167-168.
[49] Ibid., pp. 180-181.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The abdication of al-Ḥasan is treated at length by Madelung in his book, *The Succession to Muḥammad.* Generally speaking, Madelung depends on al-Madā'inī's reports which were provided by the accounts of al-Balādhurī, al-Isfahānī and Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd. Dealing with the correspondence between Muᶜāwiya and al-Ḥasan, he stresses that Muᶜāwiya was prepared to resort to any means to get al-Ḥasan to renounce his caliphate, commenting that "The proper course could be to treat him [al-Ḥasan] with dignified condescension, to cajole and dupe him with false promising."[50] Concerning the conditions of the agreement between Muᶜāwiya and al-Ḥasan, he relies on the versions of al-Balādhurī and Ibn Aᶜtham. Accepting the accounts that Muᶜāwiya refused to fulfill his promises to al-Ḥasan, Madelung states, "No keen observer of the game of politics could have been in doubt that Muᶜāwiya ever had had any intention of fulfilling his exorbitant promises made for the noble purpose of shortening the war."[51]

In refusing al-Ḥasan's caliphate, Muᶜāwiya's intention was not to become a caliph who follows the Book of God, the Sunna of the Prophet and the conduct of the Rightly Guided Caliphs, but rather to have full control over the masses and to become a king. Describing Muᶜāwiya's caliphate, Madelung affirms, "The caliph became counterpart and successor to the Roman-Byzantine emperors. He took over the old crown lands conquered by the Muslim armies as his divine right. He ruled Muslims as his subjects, absolute lord over their life and death."[52]

Madelung refuses to accept al-Zuhrī's account, quoted by al-Ṭabarī, that al-Ḥasan was the first to ask Muᶜāwiya for an agreement and enumerate the conditions under which

---

[50] Wilferd Madelung, *The Succession to Muḥammad: A Study of the Early Caliphate*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, p. 315.
[51] Ibid., p. 324.
[52] Ibid., p. 326.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

he would obey him. He believes that al-Zuhrī's account is unreliable, describing it as Umayyad propaganda against al-Ḥasan.[53]

In order to pave the way for the succession of his son Yazīd, Muᶜāwiya had to remove any rivals from the scene; al-Ḥasan was the first challenger to be removed. In this respect, Madelung accepts the reports that al-Ḥasan was poisoned by his wife Jaᶜda at the instigation of Muᶜāwiya, commenting that, "Theses reports are not, as often suggested, accepted only by Shiᶜite sources, but also by the major Sunnite historians al-Wāqidī, al-Madā'inī, ᶜUmar b. Shabba, al-Balādhurī and al-Haytham b. ᶜAdī."[54]

Al-Ḥusayn rejected Muᶜāwiya's caliphate and condemned him for killing innocent people, but refused to respond to the call of the people of Kūfa to rise up against him, honoring the agreement between Muᶜāwiya and al-Ḥasan. Al-Ḥusayn condemned Yazīd's caliphate and conduct as he had done with Muᶜāwiya. Neither was entitled to the caliphate and neither was considered legitimate. The relation between Muᶜāwiya's caliphate and al-Ḥusayn's uprising, which is not discussed by any of the above-mentioned works, is carefully considered in my thesis.

Veccia Vaglieri's, "al-Ḥusayn B. ᶜAlī B. Abī Ṭālib," is the only academic work that focuses on the history of al-Ḥusayn. In this encyclopedia entry, Veccia Vaglieri depends exclusively on al-Ṭabarī and al-Balādhurī, ignoring other important sources, such as, Ibn Saᶜd, Ibn Qutayba and Ibn Aᶜtham.[55] This is perhaps why she does not deal with the lengthy process of Muᶜāwiya's attempts to secure Yazīd's caliphate, recorded in Ibn Qutayba, Ibn ᶜAtham and Khalīfa Ibn Khayyāṭ. However, this process is very important

[53] Ibid., p.329.
[54] Ibid., p. 331.
[55] Veccia Vaglieri, "al-Ḥusayn B. ᶜAlī B. Abī Ṭālib," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971, 3: 608.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

for the present study, since it shows that Yazīd became caliph only because of his father's manipulation; otherwise, he was not entitled to the caliphate. Moreover, Muᶜāwiya tried to compel the prominent persons of Medina to recognize Yazīd's caliphate. Al-Ḥusayn refused to submit to this demand, and consequently, was killed.

In the section of her article entitled, "Attitude towards Muᶜāwiya," Veccia Vaglieri claims that al-Ḥusayn "went often to Damascus where he received further largesse,"[56] although there is no proof in the sources for this claim. She also ignores al-Ḥusayn's letter to Muᶜāwiya, in which he condemns Muᶜāwiya's crime of killing Ḥujr Ibn ᶜAdī al-Kindī (51/671) and some other followers of ᶜAlī, in spite of the fact that a complete narration of this letter was recorded by al-Balādhurī on whose accounts she relies.

A brief narrative description of the killing of Muslim Ibn ᶜAqīl, the journey of al-Ḥusayn from Mecca to Karbalā' and the battle of Karbalā' is recorded in this article,[57] but the reason for al-Ḥusayn's uprising and his arguments for the illegitimacy of Yazīd's caliphate are not discussed.

In another section entitled, "Events after the battle," the author states that when al-Ḥusayn's head was placed in front of Ibn Ziyād and Yazīd, "each reacted differently." She maintains that while the former "was insulting, knocking out some teeth with his switch," Yazīd, "according to most of the traditions, was respectful and appeared to regret the haste with which his governor had acted..."[58] In fact, both al-Ṭabarī and al-Balādhurī, on whose accounts the author based her article, report that Yazīd treated al-Ḥusayn's head in the same manner as his governor Ibn Ziyād.[59]

---

[56] Ibid., p.607.
[57] Ibid., pp. 608-611.
[58] Ibid., p.611.
[59] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 356. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, 3: 416.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The rest of Veccia Vaglieri's article focuses on "The legend of Ḥusayn, Marvels connected with his death", "Supernatural attributes of Ḥusayn which caused marvels" and "Judgments on Ḥusayn."[60]

In another entry, "al-Ḥasan B. ᶜAlī," Veccia Vaglieri briefly describes al-Ḥasan's caliphate, the letters between al-Ḥasan and Muᶜāwiya, and the circumstances under which al-Ḥasan renounced his caliphate, but does not mention the sources used.[61] However, this entry does mention the conditions of the agreement concerning al-Ḥasan's abdication. The author argues about certain conditions that were recorded by several important sources, such as the question of the caliphate after Muᶜāwiya's death and Muᶜāwiya's promise to follow the "Book of God, the Sunna of the Prophet and the conduct of the righteous caliphs..."[62] Veccia Vaglieri forgets the fact that Muᶜāwiya was ready to submit to any conditions laid down by al-Ḥasan, as noted earlier, and that he did not fulfill his promises. A small part of this entry deals with "Al-Ḥasan's physical and moral attributes," and the rest of it focuses on the Shīᶜī view of al-Ḥasan.[63]

It is evident from the various works dealing with al-Ḥusayn cited above that no complete historical study of the subject has been compiled from the classical Arabic sources. This thesis is not a narrative account of al-Ḥusayn's life, but rather an analytical study of al-Ḥusayn's uprising and his killing, based exclusively on references to the classical Arabic sources, which were compiled in the third and fourth century A.H. In my thesis, I discuss and reconstruct all the events and circumstances from the time when al-Ḥusayn moved from Medina, his grandfather's residence, to when he was killed at

[60] Veccia Vaglieri, "al-Ḥusayn B. ᶜAlī B. Abī Ṭālib," 3: 612-15.
[61] Veccia Vaglieri, "Al-Ḥasan B. ᶜAlī B. Abī Ṭālib," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 3: 241.
[62] Ibid., p. 242.
[63] Ibid.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Karbalā'. I also examine different accounts of these events. My aim is to investigate the purpose of al-Ḥusayn's uprising and how it ended with his killing.

The fullest and most comprehensive account of al-Ḥusayn's uprising and the battle of Karbalā' was narrated by the famous historian Abū Mikhnaf (d. 157/773), who is our main source of knowledge for the study of Iraq in general and for the events surrounding al-Ḥusayn's uprising in particular.[64] Abū Mikhnaf, who was considered by both Shīᶜī and Sunnī scholars as one of the outstanding Shīᶜī historians,[65] was the first historian to produce a comprehensive account of Karbalā' and his work on al-Ḥusayn has been quoted by many historians and is generally regarded as reliable and authentic. Jafri states that Abū Mikhnaf "has been thoroughly and critically studied by scholars such as Wellhausen and others, and recently by Ursula Sezgin; all have found him generally the most reliable and authentic writer on the annals of Kūfa and Iraq under the Umayyads."[66]

Regardless of the fact that Abū Mikhnaf's account contains myths and exaggerated events, according to Jafri "the whole account is reliable."[67] According to Dixon, "On the whole, Abū Mikhnaf, though at times showing Iraqi and Shīᶜī sympathy, is generally accurate in his information and more reliable than other sources."[68] Veccia Vaglieri affirms that Abū Mikhnaf's accounts, when "taken all together... form a coherent and

---

[64] Kāmil Salmān al-Jubūrī, *Nuṣūṣ min Ta'rīkh Abū Mikhnaf*, 2 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Maḥajja al-Bayḍā', 1999, 1: 5.

[65] Milḥim, *al-Mu'arrikhūn al-ᶜArab wal-Fitna al-Kubrā*, Beirut: Dār al-Ṭalīᶜa, 1998. p. 27. Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd (d. 655/1257) wrongly claims that Abū Mikhnaf was not Shīᶜī and by no means considered among Shīᶜī scholars. See his *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāgha*, 20 vols. Cairo: Dār Iḥyā' al-Kutub al-ᶜArabiyya, 1965,1: 147.

[66] Jafri, *The Origins*, p. 212. For Sezgin and her book *Abū Mikhnaf: Ein Beitrag zur Historiographie des Umaiyadischen Zeit*, Leiden: Brill, 1971, I depend on Jafri.

[67] Ibid., p. 216.

[68] ᶜAbd al-Ameer Dixon, *The Umayyad Caliphate 65-86/684-70*, London: Luzac and Company, 1971, p. 11. Dixon does not discuss al-Ḥusayn in his work. It should be mentioned also that in his article on Yazīd's caliphate, Lammens does not deal with al-Ḥusayn's uprising and death; he focuses only on Yazīd and Muᶜāwiya. See his "Le Califat de Yazīd 1ᵉʳ," *Mélanges de la Faculté Orientale*, London: Luzac and Co. 1910, pp. 233-312.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

credible narrative."[69] Wellhausen considers Abū Mikhnaf the grand authority (*ḥujja kubrā*) on the history of the Kūfa events, even though "he was a Shīᶜī, Kūfī and his sympathy was with ᶜAlī."[70] In his two books mentioned above, Wellhausen depends exclusively on the works of Abū Mikhnaf in relation to the events in Iraq and affirms that many other versions agree with Abū Mikhnaf's account.[71] He maintains that Abū Mikhnaf's accounts "do not have any real discrepancy in the main points and the whole picture of the events is complete and coherent."[72] Gibb believes that Abū Mikhnaf presents an Iraqī or Kūfan, rather than purely Shīᶜī, point of view in his account,[73] and al-Dūrī states that Abū Mikhnaf "is more favorably inclined to Iraq as opposed to Syria."[74] Consequently, Abū Mikhnaf's account is one of the major sources of the present study.

From which sources did Abū Mikhnaf collect his accounts of these events? His strength lies in the fact that he uses the accounts of eyewitnesses who participated in, or at least were present at, these happenings. There are two categories of eyewitnesses; 1) a few of the individuals who were with al-Ḥusayn's camp but who survived, such as ᶜUqba Ibn Simᶜān (d. 70?/689), who was the slave (*mawlā*) of al-Rabāb, al-Ḥusayn's wife; and 2) those who were with the Umayyad forces, who comprise the majority of the eyewitnesses. Some of these latter were sympathetic to al-Ḥusayn and were reluctant to fight against him; for example Ḥumayd Ibn Muslim (d. 72?/691), many of whose traditions were narrated by Abū Mikhnaf. Ḥumayd Ibn Muslim had a strong relationship with the Umayyad government but later participated with al-Tawwābūn (the penitents)

---

[69] Veccia Vaglieri, "Al-Ḥusayn b. ᶜAlī b. Abī Ṭālib," *EI*^{2}, 3: 610.
[70] Wellhausen, *al-Khwārij wal-Shīᶜa*, p. 133.
[71] Ibid.
[72] Ibid.
[73] H.A.R. Gibb, "Abū Mikhnaf," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 1: 140.
[74] A. A. al-Dūrī, *The Rise of Historical Writing Among the Arabs*, ed. and tr. by Lawrence I. Conrad, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990, p. 44.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and al-Mukhtār (d. 67/686). ᶜAlī Ibn al-Ḥusayn (d. 94/712), who was with al-Ḥusayn in his journey from Medina to Karbalā' and who escaped the massacre at Karbala', was another of the narrators and eyewitnesses utilized by Abū Mikhnaf.

The classical Arabic sources are remarkably rich in information about al-Ḥusayn. The fullest and most comprehensive account of Abū Mikhnaf's version of events was narrated by al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923) in his celebrated book *Ta'rīkh al-Umam wal-Mulūk.* Al-Ṭabarī relied almost entirely on the narrative of Abū Mikhnaf's version of the events on the authority of the latter's student Hishām Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Sā'ib al-Kalbī (d. 204/819).[75] Sezgin confirms that "Ṭabarī's main source of Abū Mikhnaf was Ibn al-Kalbī."[76] According to Wellhausen, all of Abū Mikhnaf's accounts depended on a complete and real chain of transmission.[77] One of the obvious concerns of al-Ṭabarī was to pay particular attention to the narration of complete chains of authorities. However, we do not know whether Hishām narrated the whole of Abū Mikhnaf's account, or whether he selected only the parts that he liked. The imperative question here is whether al-Ṭabarī modified the comprehensive account of Hishām or whether he narrated the whole account without any changes. It seems that al-Ṭabarī did not record all of Hishām's account and omitted at least some of his reports. In dealing with Abū Dharr's (d. 32/652) deportation

---

[75] Wellhausen, *al-Khawārij*, p. 131. Al-Maḥmūdī, *ᶜAbarāt al-Muṣṭafayn*, 1: 9. Like his father, Muḥammad (d. 146/763), Hishām was interested in all branches of knowledge of his time and compiled many works. Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt al-Aᶜyān wa-Anbā' Abnā' al-Zamān*, 8 vols. Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1977/1397, 6: 83. Due to his strong relations with the ᶜAbbāsid authorities, Hishām al-Kalbī was criticized for being biased against the Umayyads in his narrations. Jawād ᶜAlī, however, affirms that recent research shows that this criticism is invalid; rather, Hishām tried his utmost to expose the actual events. Jawād ᶜAlī, "Mawārid al-Ṭabarī, *Majallat al-Majmaᶜ al-ᶜIlmī al-ᶜIrāqī*, Baghdad: al-Majmaᶜ al-ᶜIlmī al-ᶜIrāqī, 1 (1954): 22. W. Atallah states, "Some Arab writers were fiercely critical of him, but such criticisms, sometimes based on scholarly rivalry, were often sectarian or motivated by religious fervor..." Attallah confirms, "Present-day research is confirming Ibn al-Kalbī's eminent role in the history of Arab literature." W. Attallah, "al-Kalbī," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 4: 496.

[76] Jafri, *The Origins*, p. 215.

[77] Wellhausen, *al-Khawārij*, p. 131.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

from Syria to Medina, al-Ṭabarī states that "Many things (*umūr*) were related concerning his deportation, but I was reluctant (*karihnā*) to narrate most of them."[78] The same statement is uttered by al-Ṭabarī in regard to ᶜUthmān's murder.[79]

Another version of al-Ḥusayn's murder is narrated by al-Ṭabarī and inserted within Abū Mikhnaf's account. This version was narrated by Muḥammad Ibn ᶜAlī Ibn al-Ḥusayn (d. 114/732)- known as al-Bāqir, on the authority of one of his followers, ᶜAmmār al-Duhnī (d. 133/750). ᶜAmmār requested that Muḥammad al-Bāqir describe to him the battle of Karbala' as if he, ᶜAmmār, had been present. Despite the fact that al-Bāqir and his father ᶜAlī witnessed all of the events from al-Ḥusayn's departure from Medina until his killing, this account has little significance since it is very brief and unclear. In this version, al-Bāqir talks about Muslim Ibn ᶜAqīl at length, yet ignores al-Ḥusayn's killing.[80] In addition, this version adds nothing to Abū Mikhnaf's account. Accordingly, it may be concluded that this account was abbreviated, perhaps either by ᶜAmmār or al-Ṭabarī.

Very occasionally, al-Ṭabarī narrates from Muḥmmad Ibn ᶜUmar al-Wāqidī (d. 207/822) and Muḥammd Ibn Saᶜd (d. 230/847).[81] However, al-Ṭabarī undermines al-Wāqidī's version by using the expression *zaᶜama* ('he alleged').[82] In regard to various events connected with Damascus, al-Ṭabarī narrates from ᶜAwāna al-Kalbī (d. 147/764), on the authority of Hishām al-Kalbī .[83] It seems that Hishām had met ᶜAwāna and narrated directly from him.[84]

---

[78] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 3: 353.
[79] Ibid., p. 399.
[80] Ibid., pp. 259-60. Although al-Bāqir was born in 57/676 and he was a child at the events of Karbalā' he acquired his information from his father and his women relatives who witnessed theses events.
[81] Ibid., pp. 290, 301.
[82] Ibid., p. 254.
[83] Ibid., pp. 254, 296-97.
[84] Ibid., p. 290.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

According to Fück, Ibn Sa^{c}d (d. 230/847) compiled his famous book, *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*, from the works of his predecessors, especially al-Wāqidī and al-Kalbī.[85] He usually gives the full *isnād*. For the events of al-Ḥasan's abdication and al-Ḥusayn's uprising and death, Ibn Sa^{c}d does not provide a complete picture of the events and his accounts are not organized into a series of narratives. It seems that Ibn Sa^{c}d did not arrange his information but added details as he gathered them. His habit was to collect many accounts from different people and different chains of authorities and present them in one single version. It is difficult to uncover Ibn Sa^{c}d's own point of view on the events, because his accounts are narrated without comment.[86] Sometimes, he uses the word *yuqāl* ('it was said') to give the impression that the account might be weak.[87] Ibn Sa^{c}d often relates accounts without naming his authorities.[88]

On the subject of al-Ḥusayn's killing, Ibn Sa^{c}d collected information from many different authorities, some of whom like al-Wāqidī, are named, though others are not specified.[89] He sometimes provides many versions of the event at hand,[90] and on some occasions narrates details that are not found in Abū Mikhnaf's account.[91] He seems, for some reason, to have deliberately abridged the material at his disposal. His list of al-Ḥusayn's male family members who were killed at Karbala' includes mistakes in regard to their names[92] and he sometimes narrated many contradictory accounts of a single event

[85] J. W. Fück, "Ibn Sa^{c}d," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 3: 22.
[86] Ibn Sa^{c}d, *Tarjamat al-Imām al-Ḥasan min al-Qism Ghayr al-Maṭbū^{c} min Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*, ed. ^{c}Abd al-^{c}Azīz al-Ṭabāṭabā'ī, Qum: Mu'assasat Āl al-Bayt li-Iḥyā' al-Turāth, 1416/1996, pp. 62-63, 76.
[87] Ibid., p. 77.
[88] Ibid., pp. 77, 83, 96.
[89] Ibn Sa^{c}d, *Maqtal al-Ḥusayn*, p. 51.
[90] Ibid., pp. 57-59
[91] Ibid., pp. 57, 66-68, 81.
[92] Ibid., p. 75.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

without mentioning the discrepancy.[93] The importance of Ibn Sa^{c}d to this study is that he provides many accounts from different chains of transmissions in regard to al-Ḥasan's abdication and his death.[94] As far as al-Ḥusayn is concerned, Ibn Sa^{c}d collects many accounts in regard to some prominent persons who advised al-Ḥusayn not to comply with the Kūfans' call, which are not found in other sources.[95] Al-Ḥusayn's journey from Mecca to Karbalā', Ibn ^{c}Aqīl's death, the description of the battle at Karbalā' and the role of the captives after al-Ḥusayn's death are all also recorded by Ibn Sa^{c}d from different authorities.[96]

Although Khalīfa Ibn Khayyāṭ (d. 240/854) relates from different historians, he narrates nothing from Abū Mikhnaf.[97] Being himself a traditionist, as were his father and grandfather, Khalīfa adopts the method of the traditionists in mentioning full *isnāds*.[98] Although Khalīfa deals only very briefly with the events of al-Ḥusayn's killing, the importance of his work for the present study rests on the fact that he narrates a detailed and clear version, on the authority of al-Zuhrī and of Dhakwān (a slave of ^{c}Ā'isha), of Mu^{c}āwiya's endeavors to secure Yazīd's succession. In this respect, and although he uses a different *isnād*, Khalīfa's report is more or less in agreement with the versions of Ibn Qutayba and Ibn A^{c}tham.[99]

Al-Imāma wal-Siyāsa, known as *Ta'rīkh al-Khulafā'*, compiled by Ibn Qutayba al-Dīnawarī (d. 276/889), is an indispensable work for the present study. The *isnāds* and

---

[93] Ibid., pp. 81-83.
[94] Ibn Sa^{c}d, *Tarjamat al-Imām al-Ḥasan*, pp. 62-3, 76-86, 94-96.
[95] Ibn Sa^{c}d, *Maqtal al-Ḥusayn*, pp. 56-61.
[96] Ibid, pp. 61-91.
[97] Dixon, *The Umayyad Caliphate*, p. 3.
[98] Khalīfa Ibn Khayyāṭ, *Ta'rīkh Khalīfa Ibn Khayyāṭ*, pp. 160, 161, 176, 179.
[99] Referring to all these accounts, it is obvious that Wellhausen was incorrect when he stated that the tradition of Mu^{c}āwiya's attempts to secure Yazīd's succession was not an actual event. See, Wellhausen, *al-Dawla al-^{c}Arabiyya*, p. 138.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

dialogue in this book are connected to eye-witnesses narrators.[100] For a single tradition, Ibn Qutayba provides many different *isnāds* on the authority of different narrators.[101] He typically collects many accounts from different authorities, all of which have the same meaning, and presents them in a single tradition.[102] For many well-known events, it was sufficient for Ibn Qutayba to utilize the word *dhakarū* or *qālū* ('they have said') instead of naming his authorities.[103] Ibn Qutayba provides a comprehensive account of Muᶜāwiya's attempts to secure his son's succession. His version is very detailed and the reader is provided with a clear picture that other sources have omitted. Indeed, Ibn Qutayba's version shares strong similarities with that of Ibn Aᶜtham. However, it should be mentioned that exaggerations have been incorporated in order to give a more interesting description of events.[104]

Aḥmad Ibn Yaḥyā al-Balādhurī (d. 279/892) is a famous Arab historian of the 3rd /9th century. Gibb states that al-Balādhurī studied under both Ibn Saᶜd (d. 230/845) and al-Madā'inī (d. 255/840).[105] Referring to al-Balādhurī's *isnāds*, Humphreys infers that he "had studied with the great biographer of the previous generation, Muḥammad Ibn Saᶜd, and through him had a close acquaintance with the tradition of al-Wāqidī (d. 207/823)."[106] Dixon believes that al-Balādhurī is one of the few historians to have dealt

---

[100] Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 1.
[101] Ibid., pp. 1-2.
[102] Ibid., pp. 27-28.
[103] Ibid., pp. 84-89, 119, 175-77.
[104] Ibid., pp. 181-183.
[105] H. A. R. Gibb, "Ta'rīkh," *Studies on the Civilization of Islam*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962. p. 116.
[106] Stephen Humphreys, *Islamic History : A Framework for Inquiry*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974. p. 99.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

objectively with the Umayyads.[107] *Ansāb al-Ashrāf* is one of the two great historical works, the second being *Futūḥ al-Buldān*, that have won general acclaim for al-Balādhurī's reliability.[108]

Many of Abū Mikhnaf's accounts are preserved in the chronicles of al-Balādhurī as well as al-Ṭabarī,[109] including those of al-Ḥusayn's uprising and the tragedy of Karbalā'.[110] Based on his in-depth knowledge of the ᶜAbbasid period and its authorities, Ibrāhīm Bayḍūn, a professor of history at the University of Beirut, asserts that al-Balādhurī must have had access to specific materials which could not have been obtained by other historians such as al-Ṭabarī.[111]

Unlike al-Ṭabarī, who interrupts the sequence of his events from time to time, al-Balādhurī focuses on only one topic which he follows to its end. He has no desire to incorporate insignificant details into his accounts and, according to al-Dūrī, subjects his sources to criticism "before taking material from them."[112]

When the *isnād* is well known, al-Balādhurī considers it sufficient to use the word *qālū* ('they said').[113] When using the terms, *wa-yuqāl* ('it was told'), *wa-qad qīla* ('it was said'), *wa-ruwiya* ('it was narrated'), *wa-zaᶜama baᶜḍuhum* ('somebody alleged'), he might have been trying to give the impression that the reports were weak.[114] Although the names of al-Ḥusayn's supporters are cited in al-Balādhurī's work, some of these are not

---

[107] Dixon, *The Umayyad Caliphate*, p. 3. Concerning al-Balādhurī's objectivity, see also Bayḍūn, "Masā'il al-Manhaj fīl-Kitāba al-Ta'rīkhiyya fī Nihāyat al-Qarn al-Thālith al-Hijrī;" *al-Munṭalaq*, no. 43, Beirut: Al-Ittiḥād al-Lubnānī lil-Ṭalaba al-Muslimīn, 1408/1988, p. 61.
[108] C.H. Becker-[F. Rosenthal], "Al-Balādhurī," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 1: 972.
[109] Gibb, "Abū Mikhnaf," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 1: 140.
[110] Veccia Vaglieri, "al-Ḥusayn Ibn ᶜAlī," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 3: 608.
[111] Ibrāhīm Bayḍūn, "Masā'il al-Manhaj," p. 59.
[112] Al-Dūrī, *The Rise of Historical Writing*, p. 62.
[113] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 275-6, 280, 285,287, 289.
[114] Ibid., 3: 295, 298-299, 390, 374 .

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

mentioned by al-Ṭabarī.[115] In one account that relates to the present study, al-Balādhurī narrates directly from a member of the Banū Hāshim without mentioning his name.[116] In addition to the fact that al-Balādhurī enables us to check al-Ṭabarī's account, his importance to this study rests on the fact that he provides some important versions of events which are not recorded by al-Ṭabarī, especially, al-Ḥusayn's attitude towards Muᶜāwiya's caliphate and his condemnation of Muᶜāwiya's crime of killing Ḥujr Ibn ᶜAdī and some other followers of ᶜAlī.[117]

Al-Akhbār al-Ṭiwāl is the only extant work of the many collections of writings by Aḥmad Ibn Dāwūd al-Dīnawarī (d. 282/895),[118] and most of the historical sources from which he gathered his material are no longer in existence.[119] Al-Dīnawarī uses a narrative style and makes no attempt to judge his sources. He shows no interest in mentioning full chains of authorities, since he tries to "present a summary derived from other works,"[120] and does not furnish "parallel traditions on the same subject."[121] At times, he does not mention his authorities, but instead uses the word *qālū* ('they said'), or the word *ruwiya* ('it was narrated') without providing a personal commentary on these accounts.[122] Although his accounts of al-Hasan's abdication are brief, they present a clear picture of events. Complete yet brief accounts of Ḥujr's protest, Muslim Ibn ᶜAqīl's death, and al-Ḥusayn's uprising and killing are also narrated by al-Dīnawarī.[123]

---

[115] Ibid., 3: 398-407.
[116] Ibid., p. 412.
[117] Ibid., 3: 366-7, 374, 398-407 and 5: 128-30.
[118] Bayḍūn, "Masā'il al-Manhaj," p. 62.
[119] Ibid.
[120] Al-Dūrī, *The Rise of Historical Writing*, p. 69.
[121] Erling Landewig Peterson, *ᶜAlī and Muᶜāwiya*, tr. P. Lampe Christensen, Copenhagen: Scandinavian University Books, 1964, p.161.
[122] Al-Dīnawarī, *al-Akhbār al-Ṭiwāl*, pp. 217, 221.
[123] Ibid., pp. 223-5, 228-259.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Al-Yaᶜqūbī (d. 284/897) is often classified as a Shīᶜī historian.[124] Bayḍūn states that this classification lacks solid proofs and is without justification, claiming that the content found in the works of any historian does not necessarily reflect that historian's own opinions.[125] Al-Durī confirms that al-Yaᶜqūbī is fair in his presentation of *akhbār* and generally accurate in the information he puts forward.[126] It is difficult to classify al-Yaᶜqūbī as Shīᶜī since his materials generally concur with other sources and contain some reports on behalf of Muᶜāwiya.[127]

Unfortunately, the accounts of al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn that are included in *Ta'rīkh al-Yaᶜqūbī* are very brief and do not provide a clear picture of events. However, al-Yaᶜqūbī makes hints during his account as a way of prompting the reader into thinking that there are other important incidents behind the events.[128] Al-Yaᶜqūbī does not consider it essential to provide *isnāds* for his accounts, and is, therefore, content to give condensed versions from his authorities.[129] Although his accounts of al-Ḥasan's abdication are brief, the circumstances under which al-Ḥasan renounced his caliphate for Muᶜāwiya can be comprehended. The same applies to al-Yaᶜqūbī's accounts about al-Ḥusayn. The complete contents of Ibn ᶜAbbās's letter to Yazīd, condemning his deeds and accusing him of being responsible for al-Ḥusayn's killing, are also recorded by al-Yaᶜqūbī.[130]

Aḥmad Ibn Aᶜtham al-Kūfī al-Kindī (d. 314/926), was an Arab historian of the 4th/10th century and the author of the famous historical work *Kitāb al-Futūḥ*. Although

---

[124] Elton L. Daniel, "Al-Yaᶜqūbī and Shiᶜism Reconsidered." In *ᶜAbbasid Studies: Occasional Papers of the School of ᶜAbbasid Studies*, ed. James E. Montgomery, Leuven: Peeters, 2004, pp. 210-11.
[125] Bayḍūn, "Masā'il al-Manhaj," p. 62.
[126] Al-Dūrī, *The Rise of Historical Writing*, p. 66.
[127] Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 229, 238.
[128] Ibid., 2: 115.
[129] Ibid., 2: 200. Milḥim's claim that al-Yaᶜqūbī takes his information directly from al-Wāqidī's work has no basis. See Milḥim, *al-Mu'arrikhūn*, p. 54.
[130] Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 248-250.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

little information is available about the author, Shaban claims that his work "proves to be a major source for the early history of the Arabs."[131] The names of Ibn A'tham's authorities are given in the introductory paragraphs of his book, and include Hishām al-Kalbī, Abū Mikhnaf, al-Wāqidī, al-Zuhrī (d. 124/741) and al-Madā'inī (d. 225/839). Since he combines all these accounts into connected historical narratives, he does not mention his authorities sequentially throughout the book.[132] However, for some important events, Ibn A'tham does refer to his authorities[133] and occasionally uses the word *qāla al-rāwī* ('the narrator said'), though without naming the specific authority.[134] Although Ibn A'tham presents pro 'Alīd viewpoints, he does not always provide accounts which can be classified as Shī'ī.[135]

In the beginning of his book, Ibn A'tham affirms that he is presenting what has been circulated and agreed upon by the *'ulamā'*, without inserting any additions from the narrators. Therefore, the criterion for Ibn A'tham is to accept traditions if they have the consensus of the scholars. His book is one of the major sources of the present study and provides important information that is omitted in other sources. His account sheds much light on events during the caliphate of al-Ḥasan and his abdication, although he condenses the traditions.[136] His narration concerning al-Ḥusayn is clear, comprehensive and coherent.

---

[131] M. H. Shaban, "Ibn A'tham al-Kūfī," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 3: 723.
[132] Ibn A'tham al-Kūfī, *Futūḥ*, 1: 368-69, 2: 215, 324.
[133] Ibid., 2: 496-97, 3: 299, 4: 260. Shaban affirms that Ibn A'tham quoted his master, al-Madā'inī, in his lifetime. This statement has no valid reference. See, M. A. Shaban, "Ibn A'tham al-Kūfī," *E.I.* 3: 723. Commenting on Shaban's claim, Humphreys states, "some of his more daring assertions seem very weakly supported by the sources." Humphreys, *Islamic History*, p. 139. Milḥim states that the resemblance between Ibn A'tham and al-Mada'inī's accounts is to be expected due to their reference to the same authorities, like Abū Mikhnaf. 'Adnān Milḥim, *al-Mu'arrikhūn al-'Arab*, p. 37.
[134] Ibn A'tham, *Futūḥ*, 1: 14.
[135] Ibid., 3: 153.
[136] Ibid., 2: 292-298.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ᶜAlī Ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Masᶜūdī (d. 346/956) is one of the best-known Arab historians. In his renowned book, *Murūj al-Dhahab*, al-Masᶜūdī notes that he collected his information exclusively from such historians as Abū Mikhnaf, al-Wāqidī and Hishām al-Kalbī.[137] Al-Masᶜudī's accounts are generally very brief and without *isnād*, except on one occasion when he mentions Hishām al-Kalbī.[138] Sometimes he narrates two different versions of a particular event, indicating a preference for one over the other[139] and he has new *isnāds* that cannot be found in the other sources.[140] Referring to well-known events, al-Masᶜūdī uses the word *dhukira* ('it was told').[141] His accounts about al-Ḥasan are condensed and without *isnād*; nevertheless, they cannot be ignored. Al-Masᶜūdī glosses over Muᶜāwiya's attempts to secure his son's succession[142] and provides a very brief account of al-Ḥusayn's murder, yet he lists the male members of the Banū Hāshim who were killed at Karbalā'.[143] He also dedicates a section of his work to describing Yazīd's corrupt violation of Islamic norms.[144]

Abū al-Faraj al-Isfahanī (d. 356/967) studied with many scholars, including al-Ṭabarī.[145] Muḥsin al-Amīn asserts that al-Isfahānī is reliable because he pays close attention to chains of authorities for his reports. Al-Amīn also confirms that when he compiled his second book, *al-Aghānī*, al-Isfahānī was very objective and was not influenced by any circumstances or any person.[146] Al-Isfahānī's work *Maqātil al-Ṭālibiyyīn* is a valuable source for the present study. Because of its importance, al-Mufīd

---

[137] Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj al-Dhahab*, 1: 21-23, 26.
[138] Ibid., 2: 387.
[139] Ibid., 2: 409-410.
[140] Ibid., 2: 427.
[141] Ibid.
[142] Ibid., 3: 27-29.
[143] Ibid., 3: 61-62.
[144] Ibid., 3:67-68.
[145] Abū al-Faraj al-Isfahanī, *Maqātil al-Ṭālibiyyīn*, p. 17.
[146] Al-Amīn, *Aᶜyān*, 8: 200-201.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd (d. 655/1257) both relied exclusively on his account for the events of al-Ḥasan's abdication.[147] Al-Isfahānī narrates different traditions for one incident and selects the most reliable one with full *isnāds* and various authorities, such as al-Wāqidī, Ibn Sa^{c}d, Abū Mikhnaf, al-Madā'inī and al-Sha^{c}bī (d. 104/725).[148] His account of the circumstances of al-Ḥasan's abdication, which is complete, sequential and clear, relies mostly on Abū Mikhnaf's version and cannot be found in any other source, even in al-Ṭabarī, who was al-Isfahānī's teacher.

For the events surrounding al-Ḥusayn's killing, al-Isfahānī narrates three chains of authorities; (1) Abū Mikhnaf on the authority of ^{c}Umar Ibn Sa^{c}d, the leader of the Umayyad troops at Karbalā'; (2) al-Madā'inī on the authority of Abū Mikhnaf and ^{c}Awāna Ibn al-Ḥakam; (3) Muḥammad Ibn ^{c}Alī al-Baqir on the authority of his follower ^{c}Ammār al-Duhnī.[149] Al-Isfahānī confirms that these three authorities were not always in agreement in their versions.[150] He also provides a list of the Banū Hāshim who were killed with al-Ḥusayn.[151] Al-Isfahānī went to great lengths to find out the exact dates for his accounts and to exclude the weak versions.[152] The significance of his second piece, *al-Aghānī*, lies in his narration of the full account of Ḥujr's protest and his execution, on the authority of Abū Mikhnaf.[153]

Chapter one of this dissertation studies the circumstances under which al-Ḥasan abdicated his caliphate and thoroughly investigates the truce between al-Ḥasan and Mu^{c}āwiya, as well as the conditions demanded of Mu^{c}āwiya by al-Ḥasan in order for him

---

[147] Muḥammad Ibn Nu^{c}mān al-Mufid, *al-Irshād*, 2: 9-14. Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd, *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāgha*,16: 29.
[148] Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, pp. 59-62, 77, 80, 84.
[149] Ibid., pp. 89-99.
[150] Ibid., p. 99.
[151] Ibid., pp. 87-98.
[152] Ibid., p. 92.
[153] Al-Isfahānī, *al-Aghānī*, 25 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-^{c}Ilmiyya, 1407/1986, 17: 140-157.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to be acknowledged as caliph. When he became caliph, did Muᶜāwiya adhere to his promises and his covenant with al-Ḥasan? This important question will be dealt with in the first chapter.

The main purpose of this chapter is to show the connection between Muᶜāwiya's caliphate and the uprising of al-Ḥusayn. Because of Muᶜāwiya's caliphate and his attempts to secure Yazī'd's succession, the latter became caliph. Al-Ḥusayn, who did not recognize Muᶜāwiya's caliphate and condemned his conduct, also refused to recognize Yazīd's caliphate. In al-Ḥusayn's view, neither Muᶜāwiya nor Yazīd was entitled to the caliphate; both had committed crimes against innocent people and violated Islamic principles. There was, therefore, no way in which al-Ḥusayn could recognize their illegitimate caliphates.

Ḥujr Ibn ᶜAdī al-Kindī, an ardent supporter of ᶜAlī and one of the prominent leaders of Kūfa, protested against Muᶜāwiya's policies, especially the cursing of ᶜAlī.[154] Ḥujr's protest was a source of trouble for the Umayyads in Kūfa and had far-reaching effects on the Kūfan community; his capture and execution provoked widespread condemnation of Muᶜāwiya's conduct by prominent Muslims,[155] in particular, by al-Ḥusayn. Motivated by Hujr's execution, the people of Kūfa called al-Ḥusayn to lead them in revolt against Muᶜāwiya. In fact, Ḥujr's protest encouraged the people of Kūfa to object to the Umayyad officials openly and paved the way for al-Ḥusayn's uprising. Ḥujr's protest and its significance will be discussed in Chapter One as well.

Muᶜāwiya attempted to secure Yazīd's succession by forcing all Muslims to pay homage to him. For Muᶜāwiya, the most important individuals among the prominent

[154] Al-Tabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 189.
[155] ᶜĀ'isha (d. 58/678), the Prophet's wife, was one of the prominent Muslims who condemned Muᶜāwiya. Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 183.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

notables who refused to acknowledge Yazīd's accession were the four sons of the Prophet's Companions: al-Ḥusayn Ibn ᶜAlī, ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn al-Zubayr (73/692), ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn ᶜUmar (74/693) and ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn Abī Bakr (53/673). By nominating his son Yazīd as his successor and imposing his *bayᶜa* on Muslims, Muᶜāwiya wished to make a strategic transfer of the caliphate from the Prophet and the institution of Rightly Guided Caliphs, to an institution that would be inherited by *mulk* (kingship). However, without the acknowledgment of Yazīd's caliphate by the four above-mentioned prominent notables, Muᶜāwiya could not achieve his task. The process of Muᶜāwiya's maneuvers, which took him many years to carry out and his intention to transfer the caliphate to Yazīd will be discussed in Chapter Two.

In order to consolidate his caliphate after Muᶜāwiya's demise, Yazīd ordered his governor in Medina to force al-Ḥusayn to pay homage or, if he refused, to kill him. Al-Ḥusayn, who stood by his refusal to make the *bayᶜa* to Yazīd, did not intend to fight the Umayyad officials in Medina and asked the governor to delay, under the pretext that, in order for his act of homage to be valid, it had to be made in public. Al-Ḥusayn succeeded in delaying for two days and finally left the town with his family to reside in Mecca. Yazīd's effort to get homage from al-Ḥusayn, and al-Ḥusayn's escape to Mecca, will also be studied in Chapter Two.

As soon as the inhabitants of Kūfa heard of Muᶜāwiya's death and al-Ḥusayn's refusal to recognize Yazīd's caliphate, they sent him many messengers and letters inviting and urging him to revolt against the Umayyad authorities. Before his arrival in Kūfa, al-Ḥusayn had sent his cousin, Muslim Ibn ᶜAqīl, to assess the situation there. However, in spite of thousands of pledges of allegiance made to him by the people of Kūfa, Ibn ᶜAqīl

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

failed to gain control of the situation in Kūfa and was decapitated by the new governor. The failure of Ibn ᶜAqīl's mission will be discussed in Chapter Three. Meanwhile, al-Ḥusayn, under the impression that the inhabitants of Kūfa would remain true to their word, headed towards Kūfa, but was intercepted by Umayyad forces and killed on the plains of Karbalā'. Also in chapter three, the circumstances which led to the battle of Karbalā' and, consequently, to al-Ḥusayn's killing, will be examined in detail.

Finally, in Chapter Four, we will look at the aftermath of al-Ḥusayn's death. The Kūfans felt especially remorseful about al-Ḥusayn's death. They realized that they had invited the Prophet's grandson to unite with them and lead them, but they had failed to fulfill their duty by abandoning him and leaving him and his family alone in the desert. They blamed themselves, regretting their immoral betrayal of the grandson of the Prophet. But who was, in fact, responsible for al-Ḥusayn's killing? Were Yazīd's hands clean? Was he really unhappy with the hasty demise inflicted upon al-Ḥusayn by his governor, Ibn Ziyād? If so, why did Yazīd reward the governor rather than punishing him and the others involved in al-Ḥusayn's killing? Yazīd's responsibility for al-Ḥusayn's killing cannot be revealed unless we pursue the events leading up to the displaying of al-Ḥusayn's head and the flaunting of the women of his family upon their return from Karbalā' to Damascus. Muslims in the surrounding cities knew nothing of what had happened in Karbalā' to the Prophet's family and grandson at the hands of the Umayyads. The Umayyads propagated the view that because al-Ḥusayn was a rebel *khārijī*, who had protested against the legitimate caliphate, his killing was, therefore, a victory for Yazīd.[156]

[156] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 349-350, Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 139-141.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

In the course of their journey from Karbalā' to Damascus, the captives played a significant role in exposing the true events of Karbalā' and what had happened to the family of the Prophet at the hands of the Umayyads. The captives blamed the people of Kūfa for abandoning the Prophet's grandson, reminding them of their immoral deeds. Regretting their failure to support al-Ḥusayn's cause, the people of Kūfa declared their readiness to support the family of the Prophet and condemned Yazīd's conduct. Sounds of grief and lamentation echoed over all the cities as the captives passed by during their journey. When Yazīd's family in Damascus joined the Prophet's family in their grief for the dead, Yazīd himself was induced to deny his responsibility for al-Ḥusayn's killing. In Chapter Four, I will deal with the consequences of the return of the captives to Medina and will look closely at Yazīd's responsibility for the tragic end of al-Ḥusayn.

My methodology in selecting and arranging my sources is as follows: for each event or episode, I choose a report which is not contradicted by other accounts and is supported by them. I will also mention the reports which reflect Sunnī or Shīᶜī viewpoints, which are not enhanced by other accounts.

My principal sources are: al-Ṭabarī's *Ta'rīkh al-Ṭabarī*, al-Balādhurī's *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, Ibn Aᶜtham's *Kitāb al-Futūḥ*, Ibn Qutayba's *al-Imāma wal-Siyāsa*, Ibn Saᶜd's *Tarjamat wa Maqtal al-Ḥusayn* and al-Isfahānī's *Maqātil al-Ṭalibiyyīn*. Indeed, I draw all of my sources from the earliest accounts embodied in these Classical Arabic sources by those historians who decided to set down the events in question in writing. No history of the events in question would be possible without these earliest histories.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER ONE: Historical Background

Part One: The Abdication of al-Ḥasan

The main purpose of this section is to find out the connection between Muᶜāwiya's caliphate and al-Ḥusayn's uprising and, consequently, his killing. What was the attitude of al-Ḥusayn towards Muᶜāwiya's caliphate? Did he actually recognize Muᶜāwiya's caliphate or did he reject it and why? In fact, al-Ḥusayn rejected Muᶜāwiya's caliphate, though he refused to criticize the agreement between his brother, al-Ḥasan, and Muᶜāwiya. In addition, al-Ḥusayn condemned Muᶜāwiya for not fulfilling his promises to al-Ḥasan and for violating Islamic norms. Even so, he refused the frequent calls of the inhabitants of Kūfa to rise against Muᶜāwiya because of the truce between the latter and al-Ḥasan.

Muᶜāwiya's caliphate had a direct connection to Yazīd's caliphate. It is only because of Muᶜāwiya's power as a caliph and his attempts to secure his son's accession to the throne that the latter became caliph, since he was not otherwise entitled to the caliphate. Moreover, by forcing people to pay homage to Yazīd, Muᶜāwiya deprived al-Ḥusayn who, being more entitled to the caliphate than Yazīd, refused to recognize Yazīd's claim, of his rights. In fact, Muᶜāwiya was the main cause of Yazīd's accession to the caliphate and, consequently, for al-Ḥusayn's uprising and murder.

Here, the essential question is: How was Muᶜāwiya recognized as caliph, even though he was not qualified to hold such an office?[1] Did the people of Kūfa and *al-ḥaramayn*

[1] In his letter to Muᶜāwiya, ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn ᶜAbbās told him that he had no right to the caliphate because he lacked early merit and service in the cause of Islam which was recognized as the criteria for the choice of the successor to the Prophet. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 114-5.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(Mecca and Medina), the most important provinces for Muᶜāwiya, pay homage to him willingly or were they forced to do so? Muᶜāwiya, in fact, became caliph only when al-Ḥasan renounced his right to the caliphate after his father's death. This leads to another set of questions: Why did al-Ḥasan surrender his caliphate even though the people of Kūfa paid homage to him? Under what circumstances did al-Ḥasan abdicate his caliphate? Did al-Ḥasan abdicate because he was a man of peace and had no desire to fight Muᶜāwiya, or was he forced by circumstances to do so? Part one of this chapter will deal with all of these questions in an attempt to reconstruct the events leading up to al-Ḥasan's abdication.

In dealing with al-Ḥasan's abdication and his truce with Muᶜāwiya, al-Ṭabarī, surprisingly enough and contrary to his usual style of narration, depends on selected accounts, al-Zuhrī, ᶜAwāna and al-Masrūqī's, suppressing other accounts narrated by his major authority, Abū Mikhnaf.[2] In his narration, al-Ṭabarī does not provide the exact sequence of events and, therefore, it is difficult to gain a clear and complete picture of the circumstances under which al-Ḥasan renounced his caliphate.

My own analysis relies on the following versions: 1) al-Balādhurī's account, on the authority of Abū Mikhnaf, ᶜAwāna al-Kalbī,[3] al-Madā'inī and others, since this account is more comprehensive than any other; 2) al-Isfahānī's version, most of which was narrated on the authority of Abū Mikhnaf; this account provides a clear sequence of the events. Al-Isfahānī, unlike his teacher al-Ṭabarī, narrates a complete account of al-Ḥasan's

[2] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 121-145.

[3] ᶜAwāna Ibn al-Ḥakam al-Kalbī (d. 147/764) was a Kūfan narrator and scholar of poetry and genealogy. He was accused of being pro-ᶜUthmān, fabricating traditions on behalf of the Banū Umayya. Concerning this accusation, El-Ali states, "Although he is charged with partiality towards the ᶜUthmāniyya and the Umayyads..., the quotations from his works show little evidence of prejudice...." Saleh El-Ali, "ᶜAwāna b. al-Ḥakam al-Kalbī," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 1: 760.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

abdication on the authority of Abū Mikhnaf with additions from other chains of authorities;[4] 3) and Ibn Aʿtham's reports, based on the authority of a number of historians.

According to al-Isfahānī, following the assassination of ʿAlī, al-Ḥasan was declared as caliph in Kūfa (40/660) without dispute.[5] In fact, ʿAlī had, on various occasions, expressed his conviction as to the merits of the Prophet's *ahl al-bayt* and their entitlement to the caliphate;[6] and had appointed his eldest son al-Ḥasan as his legatee.[7] Except for Muʿāwiya, who rejected al-Ḥasan's caliphate, the sources have not recorded any conflict over al-Ḥasan's succession and, therefore, it may be concluded that the people of Medina and Mecca did not oppose al-Ḥasan's caliphate.[8] Al-Ḥasan's immediate succession following the death of his father also illustrates that the people of Kūfa recognized the entitlement of the line of the Prophet's descendents through his daughter Fāṭima (d. 11/632) to the caliphate.

Following the custom of his predecessors, al-Ḥasan made a speech on the occasion of his accession to the caliphate. In his speech, he emphasized that he was the most qualified for this office. He praised the virtues of his family and his father, emphasizing his close relationship to the Prophet. Al-Ḥsasan also affirmed that he was of the "Family of the Prophet from whom God has removed grime and has purified, and whose love is required

---

[4] Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, pp. 59-80.
[5] Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, p. 62. See also, Ibn Saʿd, *Tarjamat al-Imām al-Ḥasan*, p. 76. Al-Yaʿqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 204. al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 121. Ibn Aʿtham asserts that following ʿAlī's death, the people of Kūfa paid homage to al-Ḥasan as his successor, followed by his brother al-Ḥusayn. Ibn Aʿtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 284. This report, however, has Shīʿī leanings and is not supported by the other sources.
[6] Ibn Qutayba, *al*-Imāma, 1: 11. Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd, *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāgha*, 9: 84, 164, 237.
[7] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 257, 263.
[8] Donaldson maintains that al-Masʿudī, in his work *Murūj al-Dhahab*, reports that the people of Mecca and Medina "had declared allegiance to Ḥasan, while ʿAlī was living." Dwight Donaldson, *The Shiʿite Religion* London: Luzac and Company, 1993, p. 2. I could not find such a report in al-Masʿūdī's work.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

in His Book."[9] In this speech, al-Ḥasan perhaps wanted to emphasize that he was more entitled to the caliphate than Muᶜāwiya, who had earlier refused to recognize ᶜAlī's caliphate and would probably also refuse to acknowledge al-Ḥasan's caliphate.

According to al-Balādhurī, Qays Ibn Saᶜd Ibn ᶜUbāda al-Anṣārī (d. 60/679), the son of a Companion of the Prophet, an ardent follower of ᶜAlī and a trusted commander of his army, addressed the people describing ᶜAlī's merits in Islam, his priority (*sābiqa*) and his relationship to the Prophet. He also pointed to al-Ḥasan's merits and his entitlement to the caliphate after his father, asking them to pay homage to al-Ḥasan and to submit to his orders. He was the first person to swear allegiance to al-Ḥasan.[10] According to al-Ṭabarī, Qays tried to impose a condition on al-Ḥasan regarding the *bayᶜa*, demanding that it should be based on the "Book of God, the Sunna of the Prophet and the obligation to fight against the violators (*qitāl al-muḥillīn*)." Al-Ḥasan rejected Qays' demand, declaring that the third obligation was included in the first two.[11] The focal question here is: Why did al-Ḥasan reject Qays' demand to add "fight the violators" as a third condition for receiving the *bayᶜa*? Was al-Ḥasan a man of peace, trying to avoid confrontation with Muᶜāwiya?

---

[9] A complete account of al-Ḥasan's speech is narrated by al-Isfahānī in his *Maqātil*, p. 62. In his account, al-Baladhurī reports that al-Ḥasan requested the people of Kūfa to pay homage to him and submit to him. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, 3: 279. Al-Mada'inī reports that after ᶜAlī's demise, ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn ᶜAbbās addressed the people of Kūfa stating, "The Commander of the Faithful has died and left vicegerents (*khulafā'*) after him." Mentioning to al-Ḥasan, Ibn ᶜAbbās said, "It is your decision to listen to him or not." The people cried and told Ibn ᶜAbbās about their wish to see him. Therefore, al-Ḥasan addressed them with a speech in which he said, "We are your *Amīrs* and your Imāms, and we are the family of the Prophet whom God has purified." The people of Kūfa then paid homage to him. Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd, *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāgha*, 16: 22. Ibn Aᶜtham does not mention al-Madā'inī's account in his narration about the abdication of al-Ḥasan. Contrary to al-Madā'inī's account, Ibn ᶜAtham mentions neither ᶜAbd Allāh nor ᶜUbayd Allāh Ibn ᶜAbbās who invited the people of Kūfa to swear allegiance to al-Ḥasan. Therefore, Jafri's affirmation, "The complete narrative of Madā'inī has come down to us through Ibn Aᶜtham," and his statement "Ibn Aᶜtham has recorded a complete description of the course of events from Madā'inī" is absolutely invalid. See Jafri, *The Origins*, p. 139.

[10] Al-Balādhurī, on the authority of Abū Mikhnaf, ᶜAwāna, and Ṣāliḥ Ibn Kaysān, *Ansāb*, 3: 278. See also al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 121.

[11] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 121. Al-Ṭabarī does not mention the chain of authorities for this report.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Although its *isnād* is omitted, this account was perhaps narrated by al-Zuhrī,[12] due to the fact that al-Ṭabarī depends heavily on al-Zuhrī's reports regarding al-Ḥasan's abdication. Furthermore, only al-Ṭabarī quotes al-Zuhrī's explanation that "al-Ḥasan did not favor fighting, but intended to take for himself what he could from Muᶜāwiya."[13] Therefore, al-Zuhrī, a spokesman for the Umayyad authorities and whose accounts reflect pro-Umayyad sentiments, perhaps attempts to give the impression that the latter was a man of peace who was afraid of fighting with Muᶜāwiya.

Al-Ḥasan's decision to refuse the third condition demanded by Qays perhaps was due to the fact that this requirement was not considered by the early Companions of the Prophet as one of the conditions for *bayᶜa*. Al-Ḥasan maybe was also trying to avoid having any obligation imposed on him. However, if al-Ṭabarī's account is valid, Qays Ibn Saᶜd must have had full knowledge of Muᶜāwiya's aspirations to the caliphate and must have anticipated that Muᶜāwiya would not acknowledge al-Ḥasan's caliphate, but would instead take action against al-Ḥasan as he had previously done against his father.[14] Therefore, Qays wanted to push al-Ḥasan to proceed against Muᶜāwiya before the latter moved. However, the pledge of allegiance to al-Ḥasan, according to many sources, in addition to the usual support for the Book of God and the Sunna of the Prophet, included

[12] Muḥammad Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī (d. 124/743) is one of the greatest scholars of traditions and genealogy in the Ḥijāz. He had such a close relationship with the caliph's court in Damascus that he acted as spokesman for the Umayyad authorities. Due to this fact, al-Zuhrī was accused of creating many traditions on their behalf. Peterson, *ᶜAlī and Muᶜāwiya*, p. 51. Milḥim, *al-Mu'arrikhūn*, p. 23.

[13] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 121.

[14] Regarding Muᶜāwiya's expeditions against ᶜAlī's territories, See, Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 103-107, 215-236. Al-Baladhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 197-217. Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 196-197. Khalīfa Ibn Khayyāṭ, *Ta'rīkh*, p. 150. In all these expeditions, Muᶜāwiya instructed the commanders of his armies to assault the inhabitants of the territories and to murder ᶜAlī's supporters as well as anyone who refused to pay him homage.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"the commitment to declare war on whomever al-Ḥasan declared war on and to make peace with whomever he made peace."[15]

Al-Isfahānī tells us that when news of ᶜAlī's death and al-Ḥasan's succession reached Damascus, Muᶜāwiya wrote to his commanders to assemble them. He informed them that ᶜAlī's companions were currently divided and that a group of Kūfan nobles had written to him, requesting safe-conduct for themselves and their tribes. Muᶜāwiya also instructed his commanders to prepare to come to him "with your soldiers, your determination, and your best equipment, for you shall obtain your revenge and attain your hope, and God shall ruin the people of rebellion and aggression."[16] No longer able to hide his aspirations to the caliphate after ᶜAlī's death,[17] Muᶜāwiya, who had no right to the caliphate, now wanted to reveal his refusal to recognize al-Ḥasan's caliphate by attacking al-Ḥasan and forcing the inhabitants of Kūfa to pay homage to him.

Muᶜāwiya, moreover, tried to convince the people of Syria that he was more entitled to the caliphate than al-Ḥasan, due to the latter's immaturity and ignorance of warfare. Al-Balādhurī narrates that Muᶜāwiya addressed the people of Syria, condemning al-Ḥasan's election to the caliphate. He told them that Kūfa was now governed by al-Ḥasan, who was young, inexperienced and knew nothing about warfare.[18] This account suggests that certain prominent Kūfans wanted to avoid war with Muᶜāwiya and that al-Ḥasan had decided to take action against Muᶜāwiya. This is supported by al-Balādhurī's narration

---

[15] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 279. Ibn Saᶜd, *Tarjamat al-Ḥasan*, pp. 62-63. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futuḥ*, 2: 285. Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma wal-Siyāsa*, 1: 163.

[16] Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, p. 69. See also al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 280.

[17] As mentioned earlier, Muᶜāwiya refused to acknowledge ᶜAlī's caliphate (36/656-41/661) only under the pretext of avenging ᶜUthmān's murder. He never contested with ᶜAlī that he, Muᶜāwiya, had the right to the caliphate and the people of Syria paid homage to him to avenge ᶜUthmān's murder. According to some sources, Muᶜāwiya was recognized as *amīr*, not as caliph. See al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 66, 82, 103, 205. Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 99, 122.

[18] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 280.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

that al-Ḥasan wrote to Muᶜāwiya informing him about the *bayᶜa* of the people and demanding that Muᶜāwiya submit to him.[19]

Muᶜāwiya's refusal to recognize al-Ḥasan's caliphate took the form of a series of measures designed to undermine al-Ḥasan's position. Al-Isfahānī tells us, on the authority of Abū Mikhnaf, that Muᶜāwiya had secretly sent two spies to Kūfa and to Baṣra whose mission was to write reports to Muᶜāwiya informing him about the affairs of al-Ḥasan. However, they were both discovered and executed by al-Ḥasan's supporters.[20] Regarding the two spies, al-Ḥasan wrote to Muᶜāwiya condemning his actions and threatening war, stating, "You sent men to use deception and you sent out spies as if you want to meet in battle. That is something that will soon happen."[21] Abū Mikhnaf's account seems to suggest that al-Ḥasan anticipated Muᶜāwiya's intention to attack him and prepared himself to take action against Muᶜāwiya.

Correspondence continued between al-Ḥasan and Muᶜāwiya. Al-Ḥasan wrote a letter to Muᶜāwiya arguing his right to the caliphate on the grounds that the members of the Prophet's family, who were closest to him in every aspect, were best qualified for the leadership of the community. Rejecting Muᶜāwiya's attempt to secure a position that he was not worthy of, al-Ḥasan explained the reasons why Muᶜāwiya was not entitled to the caliphate. He argued that Muᶜāwiya had "no obvious virtues to be recognized in religion or any admirable merits in Islam." On the contrary, al-Ḥasan contended that, Muᶜāwiya was "the son of the greatest enemy of the Prophet from among the Quraysh." Moreover, al-Ḥasan asked Muᶜāwiya to quit his falsehood (*bāṭil*) and to join other people who paid

---

[19] Ibid.

[20] Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, p. 62. Al-Mufīd states that the mission of the spies was to write to Muᶜāwiya with news of al-Ḥasan's business and to spoil his actions. Al-Mufīd, *Irshād*, 2: 9.

[21] Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, p. 63. The same source informs us that ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn ᶜAbbas wrote a letter from Baṣra censuring Muᶜāwiya's decision to send the two spies.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

homage to the Prophet's grandson. Because, al-Ḥasan explained, "You are aware of the fact that I am more entitled to the caliphate than you, before God and in the eyes of all trustworthy people." Finally, al-Ḥasan advised Muᶜāwiya to abandon rebellion, restrain from shedding the blood of Muslims and submit to him.[22] Al-Ḥasan based his arguments regarding entitlement to the caliphate on two bases: first, his priority (*sābiqa*) and merits in the cause of Islam; second, his close relationship to the Prophet. According to al-Ḥasan's arguments, Muᶜāwiya lacked these qualifications and, therefore, had no right to the caliphate.

Muᶜāwiya, on the other hand, did not base his arguments about the qualifications of the caliph on the principles of priority (*sābiqa*) and early merits in Islam (*faḍīla*). Rather, he asserted that the criteria for leadership of the community should be based on worldly abilities. In his response to al-Ḥasan, Muᶜāwiya did not deny the excellence of the Prophet's family, their station in Islam or al-Ḥasan's relationship to the Prophet, but argued that these were not the criteria for leadership of the community. The qualifications for leadership, according to Muᶜāwiya's arguments, were efficiency in controlling and leading subjects, ability in political affairs and administration, expansion of the empire and skill in defending Muslims. Muᶜāwiya maintained that if he knew al-Ḥasan to be more qualified than himself in these respects, he would readily respond to his summons.[23]

Was Muᶜāwiya serious in his description of the criteria for the caliphate? Was Muᶜawiya truly ready to acknowledge al-Ḥasan if it could be shown that he was better qualified for this office? The truth was that Muᶜāwiya was ambitious and wanted to gain

---

[22] Ibid., pp. 65-66. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 286-87. According to Ibn Aᶜtham, al-Ḥasan contended that, prior to his death, his father, ᶜAlī, nominated him as his successor. Since this addition of al-Ḥasan's letter is not included by al-Isfahānī, it was most likely added by Ibn Aᶜtham.

[23] Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, pp. 66-7. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 280.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

full control over the Muslim world and thus was prepared to make any concessions in order to attain this position. Muᶜāwiya even stipulated, in the last part of his letter to al-Ḥasan, that if al-Ḥasan withdrew, the caliphate would belong to him after Muᶜāwiya's death. He also promised that al-Ḥasan could take over the treasury of Iraq, and that Muslim affairs (*al-umūr*) would not be decided without his consultation.[24] Indeed, he wrote yet another letter to al-Ḥasan warning him that he would be assassinated if he persisted with his claim to the caliphate and promised that if al-Ḥasan paid him homage, the caliphate would be his after Muᶜāwiya's death.[25] Insisting on his right to the caliphate, al-Ḥasan replied, "If you follow the right path (*al-ḥaqq*) you will know I am worthy of it,"[26] and the correspondence and negotiations between Muᶜāwiya and al-Ḥasan ended without resolution.

It is obvious from these exchanges that Muᶜāwiya was not ready to acknowledge al-Ḥasan's caliphate and prepared to attack Iraq. Meanwhile, al-Ḥasan refused to renounce his right to the caliphate and decided to take action since he believed that Muᶜāwiya had no claim to the caliphate. According to al-Ḥasan, who based his arguments on religious grounds, if Muᶜāwiya became caliph, he would deviate from the conduct of the Sunna of the Prophet, the Book of God and the conduct of the Rightly Guided Caliphs and would consequently violate Islamic norms. Al-Ḥasan also believed that it was his responsibility to protect the course of the righteous caliphate and defend the Sunna of the Prophet and Islamic norms from any deviation. He, therefore, insisted that he would not renounce his caliphate. This was understood based on Muᶜāwiya's conduct at the time of ᶜAlī's caliphate when, as noted earlier, he launched many raids on ᶜAlī's territories and killed

[24] Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, pp. 66-7. Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 36. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 218.
[25] Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, p. 67.
[26] Ibid. The chain of authority is not clear in this letter but it is most likely narrated by Abū Mikhnaf.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

many innocent people. Al-Ḥasan was not mistaken in his expectations about Muᶜāwiya's conduct, as we will see later, when all his promises to al-Ḥasan were broken and he nominated his son Yazīd, who lacked qualifications for the caliphate. Yazīd would openly violate Islamic norms by his corrupt conduct and the true meaning of the caliphate would be lost. As a grandson of the Prophet and a caliph who was chosen by the people, al-Ḥasan refused to allow any kind of corruption in the community by Muᶜāwiya's caliphate and, therefore, persisted in his right to the office.

Muᶜāwiya wrote to summon his commanders to his residence. As soon as his army assembled in Damascus, he left al-Ḍaḥḥāk Ibn Qays al-Fihrī (d. 64/683) as his deputy in Damascus and headed towards Iraq until he neared the bridge of Manbij, a district on the outskirts of Kūfa. When news of Muᶜāwiya' approach reached al-Ḥasan, he sent for Ḥujr Ibn ᶜAdī al-Kindī (d. 51/671), an ardent supporter of ᶜAlī and a notable of Kinda, and ordered him to call the people of Kūfa to confront Muᶜāwiya's troops. Al-Ḥasan addressed the people of Kūfa with a passionate war speech, emphasizing the importance of *al-jihād.* By using the term "*al-jihād*" al-Ḥasan, like his father when he had used the same word in fighting against Muᶜāwiya, wished to inform the people of Kūfa that they were fighting against the enemies of Islam. This is supported by a letter written by ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn ᶜAbbās to al-Ḥasan. Ibn Aᶜtham narrates that ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn ᶜAbbās wrote from Baṣra to al-Ḥasan, urging him to take action against Muᶜāwiya and not to accept a compromise with him. Ibn ᶜAbbās described Muᶜāwiya and his supporters as enemies of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the Prophet and of God, stating that they were those who had made war against God and his Messenger previously.[27]

Al-Ḥasan told the people of Kūfa that Muᶜāwiya, having learned that they intended to march against him, had now begun to move against them; al-Ḥasan, therefore, urged them to assemble in their war camp at al-Nukhayla.[28] Al-Ḥasan, in fact, was conscious of the unpredictable nature of the people of Kūfa and was afraid that they would fail to respond to his call since he had witnessed their failure to respond to his father's call summoning them against Muᶜāwiya.[29] Al-Isfahānī reports that, in his speech, al-Ḥasan expressed his fear that the people of Kūfa would disappoint him and indeed he received no response from them. Their failure to respond to their Imām's call prompted criticism from ᶜAdī Ibn Ḥātam al-Ṭā'ī (d. 68/688), a Companion of the Prophet, who urged them to prepare to fight. Al-Ḥasan decided to camp at al-Nukhayla, a place for assembling troops on the outskirts of Kūfa, and was joined by ᶜAdī. Then, other loyal supporters of al-Ḥasan accused the people of failure to report for duty and urged them to follow their Imām. As a result, the people of Kūfa joined al-Ḥasan at his camp, and al-Ḥasan appointed al-Mughīra Ibn Nawfal as his deputy in Kūfa, ordering him to incite the people to join his cause.[30]

---

[27] A full account of this letter was recorded by Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 285-86. Al-Balādhurī mentions this letter briefly, stating that ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn ᶜAbbās wrote a letter to al-Ḥasan urging him to fight against Muᶜāwiya. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 279-80. Al-Isfahānī also mentions this letter but does not record it. Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, p. 63.

[28] Ibid. According to al-Isfahānī's account, Muᶜāwiya had just started to take action against al-Ḥasan when he learned that al-Ḥasan and his supporters intended to march against him. This contradicts Madelung's assumption when he says, "Muᶜāwiya was aware of al-Ḥasan's peaceful disposition and knew from his spies that he was not about to attack." Madelung, *Succession*, p.315.

[29] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 198, 201-2, 212. Ibn ᶜAtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 102-103, 234-235. Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 197-200.

[30] Isfahānī, *Maqtil*, pp. 69-70. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 280-1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

In this light, the value of al-Zuhrī's account is called into question, especially as it was not recorded by any source other than al-Ṭabarī. In fact, al-Zuhrī abbreviates the events at hand in a blurred and very brief account. He maintains that al-Ḥasan did not favor fighting, but intended to take for himself what he could from Muᶜāwiya and then join the community. Al-Zuhrī also relates that al-Ḥasan dismissed Qays Ibn Saᶜd from his office because he knew that Qays would not agree with his point of view and appointed ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn ᶜAbbās as the new commander of his army.[31]

Contrary to al-Zuhrī's account, Ibn Aᶜtham, Ibn Saᶜd, al-Dīnawarī and al-Yaᶜqūbī narrate that al-Ḥasan appointed Qays as the commander of his vanguard.[32] In another account, al-Ṭabarī narrates, on the authority of ᶜAwāna and al-Masrūqī, that al-Ḥasan sent Qays Ibn Saᶜd ahead of him to take charge of his vanguard and check the enemy until al-Ḥasan himself joined them with the main army.[33] None of these accounts speaks of al-Ḥasan dismissing Qays, nor does any of them mention the name of ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn ᶜAbbās as the commander of al-Ḥasan's army. This leaves us in further doubt with respect to al-Zuhrī's account.[34] According to al-Isfahānī and al-Balādhurī, al-Ḥasan appointed ᶜUbayd Allāh Ibn ᶜAbbās as commander of his vanguard and instructed him to consult Qays Ibn Saᶜd and Saᶜīd Ibn Qays, who were to be second and third in command in case ᶜUbayd Allāh was killed.[35]

---

[31] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 121.
[32] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 289. Ibn Saᶜd, *Tarjamat al-Ḥasan*, p. 63. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akbār*, p. 217. Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 214.
[33] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 122-123.
[34] Wellhausen's argument that al-Ḥasan appointed ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn ᶜAbbās as the commander of his vanguard is invalid and has no proof in the sources other than al-Zuhrī, whose account, according to Wellhausen himself, is not clear and has discrepancies. Wellhausen, *Al-Dawla al-ᶜArabiyya*, p. 106.
[35] Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, p. 71. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 281.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Because of the Kūfans' reluctance to be engaged in fighting against Muᶜāwiya and, therefore, their poor response to al-Ḥasan's call, he wanted to clarify their position, ascertain his followers' stance towards him and assure himself of their loyalty, so that they would not disappoint him on the battlefield as they had previously done with his father. On his way to confront Muᶜāwiya, al-Ḥasan halted in a place called Muẓlim Sābāṭ, in the outskirts of al-Madā'in, quartered his army there and addressed the people of Kūfa. Al-Ḥasan is said to have announced to his people, "I do not entertain any feeling of malice against a Muslim." Al-Ḥasan also told his men that he was looking out for their best interests and that reconciliation was better for them than dissension. He therefore asked them not to reject whatever decision he might take.[36] In his narration, al-Dīnawarī states that al-Ḥasan added "And I notice that most of you were disinclined to go to war and failed to fight [against Muᶜāwiya] and, therefore, I am not going to push you to something you do not like."[37]

Hearing this, al-Ḥasan's men assumed that he intended to seek a truce with Muᶜāwiya and surrender his authority to him. They interrupted his speech and some of the *khawārij* amongst his people shouted at him, accusing him of having become an unbeliever (*kāfir*) "like your father before you," and attacked him violently. They sacked his tent and took his prayer mat from beneath him. Al-Ḥasan called for his horse and escaped, surrounded by his servants and a few of his supporters. However, as they were passing by Muẓlim Ṣābāṭ, a Khārijite warrior called al-Jarrāḥ Ibn Sinān, struck al-Ḥasan's thigh with a pick-

[36] Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, pp. 71-72. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 282. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 289. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, pp. 216-7.
[37] Ibid.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

axe. Al-Ḥasan's supporters killed al-Jarrāḥ and al-Ḥasan himself was taken to al-Madā'in to be treated for his wound.[38]

Did Muᶜāwiya play a role in the mutiny of al-Ḥasan's forces? Many reports clearly indicate that he instigated numerous rumors and false announcements in al-Ḥasan's camp with the aim of dispersing soldiers from al-Ḥasan's cause. Al-Yaᶜqūbī reports that Muᶜāwiya sent spies to al-Ḥasan's camp in order to disseminate the news that Qays Ibn Saᶜd, the commander of al-Ḥasan's army, had made peace with Muᶜāwiya. At the same time, Muᶜāwiya's men announced in Qays's camp that al-Ḥasan had no desire to fight Muᶜāwiya and decided to come to terms with him.[39] This report is supported by Ibn Saᶜd's narration, on the authority of group of narrators, and by al-Ṭabarī, on the authority of al-Masrūqī. They report that al-Ḥasan sent Qays Ibn Saᶜd ahead of him with a large number of the Kūfans. Meanwhile, Muᶜāwiya marched with his Syrian army until he halted at Miskan. While al-Ḥasan was at al-Madā'in, an announcement spread in his camp that Qays Ibn Saᶜd had been killed and al-Ḥasan's men, therefore, began to desert the camp and attacked al-Ḥasan.[40]

Al-Yaᶜqūbī also narrates that Muᶜāwiya attempted to win over al-Ḥasan's supporters by proposing an offer of one million dirhams to Qays if he joined his cause or withdrew from the battle, but Qays refused.[41] Muᶜāwiya then attempted the same stratagem with ᶜUbayd Allāh and this time succeeded. ᶜUbayd Allāh accepted Muᶜāwiya's offer and fled during the night to the camp of Muᶜāwiya with most of his troops.[42]

---

[38] Ibid., p. 217. Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, p. 72. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 289-90.
[39] Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 214.
[40] Ibn Saᶜd, *Tarjamat al-Ḥasan*, p. 76. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 121-2.
[41] Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 214. Al-Balādhurī reports that when Qays Ibn Saᶜd was ᶜAlī's governor of Egypt Muᶜāwiya tried to entice him to his side and desert ᶜAlī's cause, but Qays refused. *Ansāb*, 3: 161-2.
[42] Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 214. See also al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, p. 73.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Another account narrated by al-Yaᶜqūbī states that while al-Ḥasan was at al-Madā'in, Muᶜāwiya sent three mediators to talk with him confidentially. When Muᶜāwiya's men left al-Ḥasan, they announced publicly that al-Ḥasan intended to avoid war and to spare the blood of Muslims, and had, therefore, decided to hand over the caliphate to Muᶜāwiya. Consequently, al-Ḥasan's camp was disturbed and the people of Kūfa began to assault him.[43]

According to al-Balādhurī and al-Isfahānī, Muᶜāwiya, in order to further shake the faith of al-Ḥasan's men and to destabilize their fighting strength, sent an envoy to al-Ḥasan's camp. Muᶜāwiya instructed him to announce there that Muᶜāwiya had received letters from al-Ḥasan, assuring him that he was ready to come to terms with Muᶜāwiya and that he, Muᶜāwiya's messenger, had come for that purpose. The task of Muᶜāwiya's emissary was also to talk secretly with ᶜUbayd Allāh Ibn ᶜAbbās, the commander of al-Ḥasan's army, in order to persuade and bribe him to go over to Muᶜāwiya's side. At a private meeting with ᶜUbayd Allāh, Muᶜāwiya's messenger swore to him that al-Ḥasan had asked Muᶜāwiya for a truce and that the latter offered him one million dirhams, half the amount to be paid immediately, the other half in Kūfa, if he joined Muᶜāwiya's men. ᶜUbayd Allāh accepted the offer and crept away in the night with his close associates to join Muᶜāwiya's camp. This defection caused a division in the ranks of al-Ḥasan's men.[44]

While ᶜUbayd Allāh Ibn ᶜAbbās was accepting Muᶜāwiya's offer, al-Ḥasan was still in al-Madā'in recovering from his injuries and Qays Ibn Saᶜd had taken command of the remaining vanguard. When Qays noticed his troops' desertion, he wrote to al-Ḥasan informing him of their situation. Upon receiving Qay's letter, al-Ḥasan assembled the

[43] Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 215.
[44] Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, p. 73. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 284. The name of Muᶜāwiya's envoy, according to al-Balādhurī, was ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn Samura (d. 50/670).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Iraqi leaders and nobles, addressing them in sadness and with a certain distaste, telling them that he had been informed by Qays that even the prominent people of Kūfa (tribal leaders) had run off to Muᶜāwiya. Blaming them for having disappointed his father, ᶜAlī, when he called them to fight Muᶜāwiya, al-Ḥasan told them that

> After the death of my father, you yourselves paid allegiance to me of your own accord. I accepted your homage and came out with full zeal and spirit against Muᶜāwiya. Now you are turning your faces against me in the same manner as you had done previously with my father.[45]

According to al-Zuhrī's account, the reason for al-Ḥasan's decision to come to terms with Muᶜāwiya was his love for peace, his reluctance to go to war and his dislike of bloodshed. According to al-Yaᶜqūbī, al-Balādhurī, al-Isfahānī, Ibn Aᶜtham and al-Ṭabarī, on the authority of al-Masrūqī, al-Ḥasan decided not to confront Muᶜāwiya and to come to terms with him for two reasons: first, the fickle nature of the people of Kūfa and their reluctance to fight Muᶜāwiya; and second, Muᶜāwiya's role in spreading rumors in the camps of al-Ḥasan's troops.

In fact, the leaders of the tribes in Kūfa played a significant role in regards to al-Ḥasan's decision to withdraw from fighting Muᶜāwiya and compromise with him. As noted earlier, al-Balādhurī narrates that when Muᶜāwiya decided to attack Iraq, a group of prominent leaders in Kūfa wrote to Muᶜāwiya, promising him their readiness to desert from al-Ḥasan and asking him for safe-conduct.[46] Al-Balādhurī also reports that when al-Ḥasan prepared to fight Muᶜāwiya, a group of prominent leaders of the tribes in Kūfa joined Muᶜāwiya and paid homage to him on behalf of their tribes. When the news reached al-Ḥasan, he is said to have addressed his men "O people of Iraq! You forced my

[45] Ibid., 3: 284-5. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 291.
[46] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 280.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

father to comply with the Syrians' call and to stop fighting Muᶜāwiya and deserted from him. The news reached me that the people of *sharaf* [the tribal leaders] among you joined Muᶜāwiya and swore allegiance to him."[47] Indeed, the leaders of the tribes of Kūfa had forced ᶜAlī, who was about to win the war, to stop fighting Muᶜāwiya at Ṣiffīn and comply with the maneuver of Muᶜāwiya's men to submit to the Qur'ān's judgment.[48] They also played an important role in undermining al-Ḥasan's affairs and, consequently, influenced his decision to come to terms with Muᶜāwiya. They played a vital role and were one of the main causes, as we will see later, of aborting Ibn ᶜAqīl's task to control Kūfa and of al-Ḥusayn's killing.

Who was the first to write and ask for an agreement: al-Ḥasan or Muᶜawiya? And what were the conditions stipulated in this agreement? According to al-Zuhrī's account, which was recorded exclusively by al-Ṭabarī, al-Ḥasan was the first to write to Muᶜāwiya and set out the conditions by which he would abdicate his caliphate. Muᶜāwiya received this letter after he had sent al-Ḥasan a blank sheet over his seal so that al-Ḥasan might stipulate whatever he wished. Al-Ḥasan seized this opportunity to double his previous conditions. However, Muᶜāwiya had retained al-Ḥasan's original letter. Consequently, when the two met they argued about which of the two letters was valid, even though in the end Muᶜāwiya fulfilled the conditions of neither.[49] Al-Zuhrī's account wants to depict al-Ḥasan as a man of peace who, since he did not favor fighting, was therefore, the first to reach a compromise with Muᶜāwiya. In regards to the truce, al-Zuhrī also points out that al-Ḥasan's main concern was to secure his own benefits. He does not mention any of the

---

[47] Ibid., 3: 284-5.
[48] Ibd., 3: 103. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 34-5. Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 2: 390. Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 188-9.
[49] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 121.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

conditions that al-Ḥasan demanded from Muᶜāwiya; rather he states that al-Ḥasan intended to secure whatever he could from Muᶜāwiya.[50]

Two other reports were narrated by al-Ṭabarī: al-Masrūqī's and ᶜAwāna's. According to al-Masrūqī's account, when al-Ḥasan realized that leadership was beyond his grasp, he sent to Muᶜāwiya seeking peace and Muᶜāwiya sent ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn ᶜĀmir (d. 59/680) and ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn Samura to him. When they reached al-Ḥasan at al-Madā'in, they granted him what he wished and arranged peace with him. Although al-Masrūqī states that al-Ḥasan imposed many conditions (*fī ashyā' ishtaraṭahā*) on Muᶜāwiya, he mentioned only one condition: al-Ḥasan was allowed to take five million dirhams from the treasury of Kūfa. According to ᶜAwāna's report, al-Ḥasan not only was the first to ask Muᶜāwiya for a truce, but also demanded from Muᶜāwiya safe-conduct. Besides money, ᶜAwāna narrates that al-Ḥasan came to terms with Muᶜāwiya on the condition that the cursing of ᶜAlī, a practice of Muᶜāwiya's since ᶜAlī's caliphate, should be abolished in al-Ḥasan's presence.[51] Based on the reports of al-Masrūqī and ᶜAwāna, al-Ṭabarī wants to tell us that al-Ḥasan was the first to ask for an agreement with Muᶜāwiya and was the first to stipulate his conditions, but al-Ṭabarī does not cite all these conditions.

A different version of the agreement is provided by Ibn Aᶜtham and al-Balādhurī, on the authority of Abū Mikhnaf, ᶜAwāna and Ṣāliḥ Ibn Kaysān, who both narrate that Muᶜāwiya was the first to request a settlement. According to this version, Muᶜāwiya sent ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn ᶜĀmir and ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn Samura as his envoys to al-Ḥasan. Both of them implored al-Ḥasan to spare the blood of the people of Muḥammad, and confirmed

[50] Ibid.
[51] Ibid., 4: 122-3.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

that Mu^{c}āwiya would appoint him his successor and grant him whatever he desired. Al-Ḥasan initially accepted the offer and sent ^{c}Amr Ibn Salama and Muḥammad Ibn al-Ash^{c}ath to confirm this agreement. Mu^{c}āwiya assured al-Ḥasan that he would make peace with him on condition that the caliphate would belong to al-Ḥasan after Mu^{c}āwiya's death. In addition to the money to be granted to al-Ḥasan, Mu^{c}āwiya also confirmed that he would commit no harm against him. However, al-Ḥasan was not completely satisfied with these terms. He replied that he would surrender reign over the Muslims to Mu^{c}āwiya on these conditions: 1) that Mu^{c}āwiya must act according to the Book of God, the Sunna of the Prophet and the conduct (*sīra*) of the righteous caliphs; 2) that Mu^{c}āwiya had no right to nominate a successor after him but the caliphate would be decided by *shūrā* (consultation); 3) that the people were granted safety wherever they lived, with respect to themselves, their property and their successive generations; 4) that Mu^{c}āwiya must seek no harm, wrongdoing or dangerous act, secretly or openly, against al-Ḥasan; and 5) that Mu^{c}āwiya must not intimidate any of al-Ḥasan's companions.[52]

According to the above-mentioned account, al-Ḥasan refused to hand over his caliphate to Mu^{c}āwiya unless he imposed his own conditions on him, although Mu^{c}āwiya was ready to accede to whatever al-Ḥasan wished. One of al-Ḥasan's condition was that Mu^{c}āwiya should conduct himself according to the Book of God and the Sunna of the Prophet. This condition was agreed upon by the early Companions of the Prophet, as noted previously. In fact, the legitimacy of the caliph would be called into question if his conduct deviated from the Book of God and the Sunna of the Prophet. Before renouncing

[52] Al-Baladhurī, on the authority of Abū Mikhnaf, ^{c}Awāna and Ṣāliḥ Ibn Kaysān, *Ansāb*, 3: 287. Ibn A^{c}tham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 293. Al-Isfahānī mentions this account briefly. *Maqātil*, p. 74-75. It should be noted that according to Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 136 and al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 218, al-Ḥasan handed over his caliphate to Mu^{c}āwiya on condition that after Mu^{c}āwiya's death the caliphate should revert to al-Ḥasan.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

his authority, al-Ḥasan wanted to be sure that Muᶜāwiya would not violate Islamic norms and that would follow the Rightly Guided Caliphs. In order to protect the caliphate from any deviation, al-Ḥasan, according to al-Balādhurī and Ibn Aᶜtham's version, imposed the further condition that Muᶜāwiya had no right to nominate his successor; the caliphate should be left to be decided by consultation. Al-Ḥasan also wanted to secure the safety of ᶜAlī's followers by imposing the condition that Muᶜāwiya must not terrorize any of al-Ḥasan's companions.

Now, the question is: Did the people of Kūfa swear allegiance to Muᶜāwiya willingly? Although they were reluctant to fight against Muᶜāwiya, they refused to acknowledge his caliphate after al-Ḥasan's abdication. When he entered Kūfa in 41/661, Muᶜāwiya noticed that the people there were reluctant to pay him homage and, therefore, demanded that al-Ḥasan make a speech to the people confirming that he had renounced his authority and pledged allegiance to Muᶜāwiya. Once again, al-Ḥasan wanted to clarify the fact that he had a greater entitlement to the caliphate than Muᶜāwiya, who had no right to it. In his speech, al-Ḥasan reminded the people that he and his brother al-Ḥusayn were the only grandsons of the Prophet, that he had a right to the caliphate and that Muᶜāwiya contested this right which belonged to him. Al-Ḥasan affirmed that he had renounced his right to Muᶜāwiya in the best interest of the community. He also reminded the Kūfans that they had pledged allegiance to him on the bases that they would make peace with whomever al-Ḥasan made peace and that they would fight whomever he fought.[53]

[53] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 287-8. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 295. Ibn Saᶜd, *Tarjama*, p. 80. Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 163.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Al-Isfahānī reports that as soon as al-Ḥasan abdicated (41/661), Muᶜāwiya ordered him to address the people of Kūfa. In his speech, al-Ḥasan wanted to clarify the meaning of the true caliph, explaining that the caliph is the one who acts according to the Book of God and the Sunna of the Prophet: he is not the one who acts unjustly; the latter is only a king.[54] According to this account, al-Ḥasan intended to confirm that Muᶜāwiya's caliphate would not be considered legitimate unless Muᶜāwiya acted in accordance with the Sunna of the Prophet and the Book of God.

Muᶜāwiya then addressed the people of Kūfa, stating that when any disagreement had occurred in the community after the death of the Prophet, the people of the wrong (*bāṭil*) prevailed over the people of the right. When Muᶜāwiya realized that he condemned himself by this statement, he regretted his words and added: "Except for this nation." At this point, Muᶜāwiya decided to disclose his intention to succeed to the caliphate and have full power over the people of Kūfa. He continued:

> By God, I have not fought against you that you might pray, nor fast, nor perform the pilgrimage, nor pay alms, since you are doing that already. Rather, I fought you in order to command you as your ruler, and God had granted that to me against your desire.[55]

Muᶜāwiya also announced to the people of Kūfa that he had no intention of fulfilling his promises to al-Ḥasan and went on to declare, "all conditions I have promised al-Ḥasan are now under my feet."[56] Muᶜāwiya's speech clearly indicates that he would not follow in the footsteps of the Prophet and the Rightly Guided Caliphs. Hearing this, the people of Kūfa, who earlier swore allegiance to al-Ḥasan because of his merits and close

---

[54] Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, p.80.
[55] Ibid., pp. 77-8. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 295-96
[56] Ibid. Al-Isfahānī, p. 77-8. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 289. Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 164.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

relationship to the Prophet, would not accept Muᶜāwiya as the new caliph and the legitimacy of his caliphate was to be called into question. This is indicated by the following accounts.

Al-Balādhurī narrates that the people of Kūfa swore allegiance to Muᶜāwiya only when they were threatened by him. He reports that Muᶜāwiya warned the people about punishment if they did not come forth and pay him homage within a respite of three days. "Whoever has not pledged allegiance by then will have no protection and no pardon." The people of Kūfa hastily came from every direction to pay homage to Muᶜāwiya.[57] Al-Yaᶜqūbī confirms that the people paid homage to Muᶜāwiya unwillingly and with abhorrence. He also reports that Saᶜd Ibn Mālik saluted Muᶜāwiya as a king. When Muᶜāwiya asked Saᶜd why he had not saluted him as "The Commander of the Faithful," Saᶜd replied, "We did not elect you; you are but a usurper."[58]

Ibn Aᶜtham tells us that when they heard about al-Ḥasan's abdication, the people of Fārs refused to pay homage to Muᶜāwiya. He also narrates that when the news of the abdication of al-Ḥasan reached the people of Baṣra, they rioted, declaring that they would not accept Muᶜāwiya's caliphate. Ḥumrān Ibn Abān of Banū al-Namir rose in revolt; he took over the town and called for al-Ḥusayn's leadership. Upon hearing the news that Muᶜāwiya had sent a force to Baṣra in order to subdue the riot, the people who had protested scattered and remained in their houses.[59]

---

[57] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 290.
[58] Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 217.
[59] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 298-300.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Was al-Ḥusayn satisfied with al-Ḥasan's decision to come to terms with Muᶜāwiya? And, what was his attitude towards Muᶜāwiya's caliphate? According to some sources, al-Ḥusayn declared to his brother that he was reluctant to consent to his agreement with Muᶜāwiya.[60] In spite of the fact that al-Ḥusayn resisted al-Ḥasan's renunciation of his authority, he honored the truce with Muᶜāwiya and paid homage to him. Although the sources do not mention al-Ḥusayn's *bayᶜa* directly or the way he swore allegiance to Muᶜāwiya, it is clear that al-Ḥusayn followed his brother's decision and paid homage to Muᶜāwiya. This is indicated by al-Balādhurī and al-Dīnawarī's accounts according to which al-Ḥusayn rejected the Kūfans' call to rise against Muᶜāwiya, explaining that he could not dissolve his *bayᶜa*.[61]

Ibn Aᶜtham, on the other hand, reports that al-Ḥusayn refused to pay homage to Muᶜāwiya and that al-Ḥasan advised Muᶜāwiya to leave al-Ḥusayn, explaining "Al-Ḥusayn will never swear allegiance to you unless he dies and he will not die unless all the Banū Hāshim die with him."[62] In fact, Ibn Aᶜtham's account reflects a pro-ᶜAlīd' tendency and is not supported by any other source.

Acting on Muᶜāwiya's declaration that he would not fulfill his promises to al-Ḥasan, a group of al-Ḥasan's followers, headed by Sulaymān Ibn Ṣurad al-Khuzāᶜī (d. 65/684), who was an ardent follower of ᶜAlī and one of the penitent leaders, came to visit al-Ḥasan following his abdication. Sulaymān reminded him of Muᶜāwiya's statement that he would ignore all the conditions that he had promised al-Ḥasan and asked him therefore to break

[60] Ibid., 2: 297. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 122. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 293, 363.
[61] Ibid., 3: 363. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 203.
[62] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ* 2: 294.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the truce and fight Mu^{c}āwiya. Al-Ḥasan, however, refused and confirmed that he intended to make peace with Mu^{c}āwiya in order to avoid shedding the blood of Muslims.[63]

Realizing that al-Ḥusayn was reluctant to accept al-Ḥasan's truce with Mu^{c}āwiya and conscious of his entitlement to the caliphate after his brother, a group of ^{c}Alī's followers were ready to break their allegiance with Mu^{c}āwiya and make a new *bay^{c}a* with al-Ḥusayn, provided that the latter would rise against Mu^{c}āwiya. Al-Ḥusayn, however, refused to comply, advising them to wait until Mu^{c}āwiya's death.[64] Although al-Ḥusayn agreed with these people that Mu^{c}āwiya had no right to the caliphate, he did not want to break his brother's truce. Furthermore, al-Ḥusayn believed that Mu^{c}āwiya had the ability to abort any attempt to revolt against him, since he had witnessed Mu^{c}āwiya's role in undermining al-Ḥasan's affairs. Al-Ḥusayn, in fact, believed that Mu^{c}āwiya would not act according to the Book of God and the Sunna of the Prophet and would not follow in the footsteps of the righteous caliphs, since Mu^{c}āwiya had declared that he would not fulfill any of al-Ḥasan's conditions. Mu^{c}āwiya would also deprive those who were entitled to the caliphate of their rights, as he had done with al-Ḥasan, and would nominate somebody who was not qualified for it. Since this would have hazardous consequences for the Muslim community and was also an obvious deviation from the true caliphate and from Islamic norms, al-Ḥusayn would not accept this violation and would not stay silent. Al-Ḥusayn, therefore, advised his followers to stay calm so long as Mu^{c}āwiya was alive and wait for further action after his death.

---

[63] Al-Balādhrī, *Ansāb*, 3: 290-1. Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 164. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, pp. 220-1. Ibn ^{c}Atham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 296. Instead of Sulaymān, Ibn A^{c}tham mentions al-Musayyab Ibn Najaba, one of the penitents' leaders.

[64] Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, pp. 220-1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Part two: The Significance of Ḥujr's Protest

We have seen in the first part of this chapter that al-Ḥasan handed over his right to the caliphate and paid homage to Muᶜāwiya only when he realized that he could not fight him with hesitant supporters. However, al-Ḥasan's abdication was made after setting terms with which Muᶜāwiya agreed to comply. Many questions present themselves here: 1) Did Muᶜāwiya adhere to these conditions? As mentioned earlier, Muᶜāwiya publicly declared to the people of Kūfa that he would not fulfill any of his promises to al-Ḥasan. According to many sources, as we will see below, Muᶜāwiya violated his agreements with al-Ḥasan: he killed Ḥujr and his companions, he nominated his son Yazīd as his successor and he poisoned al-Ḥasan. In Kūfa, Muᶜāwiya even cursed ᶜAlī in the presence of al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn following al-Ḥasan's abdication.[65]

2) Why did Muᶜāwiya deliberately break all his promises to al-Ḥasan and why did he not adhere to the conditions of the truce? Originally, Muᶜāwiya accepted al-Ḥasan's conditions and, moreover, was ready to give al-Ḥasan whatever he asked in order to gain full power over the masses without fighting, as he had already announced to the people of Kūfa.

Since he had gained the Kūfans' recognition for his caliphate, Muᶜāwiya was not obliged to hold fast to any conditions concerning it. His intention was to create a new policy and a new phase in his caliphate. He was not prepared to follow the Book of God and the Sunna of the Prophet; rather he wanted to rule the masses and act according to his own discretion and his own policy. Nor was he ready to follow in the footsteps of the

[65] Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, pp. 77-8.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Rightly Guided Caliphs concerning the succession to the caliphate. Instead, he wanted to change the caliphate into a kingship, based neither on the merits of defending Islam nor on any qualification for the caliphate, so that he could be sure that the caliphate would remain in his family. Whether or not he was qualified to succeed to the caliphate, Muᶜāwiya intended to nominate his son as his successor to that office. Simply, Muᶜāwiya was not ready to be controlled by any Islamic regulations, but wanted to control people according to his own regulations. 3) What were the consequences of Muᶜāwiya's new strategy for the Muslim community and what was the connection between this new policy and al-Ḥusayn's uprising? Part two of this chapter deals with these questions.

Having secured the *bayᶜa* from the Iraqī people, Muᶜāwiya attempted to consolidate the legitimacy of his power. However, for the followers of ᶜAlī in Kūfa, who strongly believed that the Prophet's family was entitled to the caliphate, Muᶜāwiya's caliphate was always in doubt. In spite of his abdication, al-Ḥasan was regarded as the leader of the Shīᶜa after ᶜAlī's death, as his brother al-Ḥusayn had emphasized. As noted earlier, when al-Ḥasan renounced his caliphate to Muᶜāwiya, some of ᶜAlī's supporters in Kūfa came to al-Ḥusayn and declared their desire to pay homage to him, provided that he would fight Muᶜāwiya. Al-Ḥusayn refused their appeal, explaining that he would not accept their oath of allegiance as long as al-Ḥasan was alive.

Although cursing ᶜAlī was to have been banned according to the truce between al-Ḥasan and Muᶜāwiya, regular public cursing of ᶜAlī in the congregational prayer was imposed by Muᶜawiya as a propaganda measure. Marwān Ibn al-Ḥakam (d. 65/679), one of the most important Umayyad leaders, clearly recognized that the cursing of ᶜAlī was an

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

important tool of government. According to al-Balādhurī, on the authority of al-Madā'inī, when asked by ᶜAlī Ibn al-Ḥusayn, grandson of the fourth caliph ᶜAlī, about the reason for the cursing, Marwān replied: "Our reign would not be sound without that."[66]

In fact, Muᶜāwiya continued his policy of cursing ᶜAlī, which was practiced during ᶜAlī's lifetime, becoming a regular institution after prayer times even in Kūfa, the residence of ᶜAlī and his followers. Although Muᶜāwiya had gained full power over Kūfa, he insisted on the cursing of ᶜAlī in public. Was Muᶜāwiya's intention in cursing ᶜAlī to bring out into the open the opposition to the Umayyad officials in order to facilitate his measures of repression? In practice, Muᶜāwiya actually intended to breach his contract with al-Ḥasan and demonstrate to the people of Kūfa that he would not fulfill any of his promises to him. He also intended to show that he had full power over them and that they had no choice but to submit to the orders of the new caliph. By cursing ᶜAlī, Muᶜāwiya perhaps intended to arouse ᶜAlī's supporters' open opposition to him, thus subjecting them to execution.

When al-Mughīra Ibn Shuᶜba was appointed governor of Kūfa in 41/661, one of the orders imposed on him by Muᶜāwiya was that he should "Never desist from abusing and censuring ᶜAlī, from praying for God's mercy and forgiveness for ᶜUthmān, from disgracing the followers of ᶜAlī, from removing them and not listening to them."[67] Al-Mughīra carried out these instructions although he was reluctant to involve himself in a confrontation with the followers of ᶜAlī. Ḥujr Ibn ᶜAdī al-Kindī (d. 53/672), a companion of the Prophet, an ardent supporter of ᶜAlī and a prominent leader of Kinda, could not

[66] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2: 407.
[67] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 188. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 252. Al-Ṭabarī and al-Balādhurī report this account on the authority of Abū Mikhnaf and other narrators.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

tolerate the cursing of ᶜAlī and acted as spokesman of ᶜAlī's followers. Whenever he heard the governor cursing ᶜAlī and praying for ᶜUthmān in the mosque, Ḥujr would rise and protest, quoting the Qur'ān (IV: 135): "Stand up in justice unto God and give witness that the one whom they censured and blamed was more worthy of excellence."[68]

In fact, Ḥujr was not protesting exclusively against the cursing of ᶜAlī. Rather, he objected to Muᶜāwiya's policies as a whole and complained that Muᶜāwiya was not acting according to the Book of God and the Sunna of the Prophet. By his conduct, Muᶜāwiya had broken all his promises, as indicated by the account of how, when al-Mughīra was cursing ᶜAlī and his followers in the mosque of Kūfa, Ḥujr objected and loudly shouted, "You do not know whom you are cursing, you have become an old man! Give us our stipends and shares of the treasury of which you have deprived us, although you have no right to do so."[69] A group of thirty or more people agreed with Ḥujr, insisting that the governor should give them their stipends and telling him that his speech was of no use to them.[70] According to al-Ṭabarī, Ḥujr also told al-Mughīra that he had become "... interested in condemning the Commander of the Faithful [ᶜAlī] and praising the murderers."[71] Ḥujr and his partisans clearly believed that ᶜAlī remained the only person worthy of the title "Commander of the Faithful" and censured Muᶜāwiya, whom they considered an usurper of the rights of the house of ᶜAlī. Obviously, Muᶜāwiya's policy of

---

[68] Al-Isfahānī, *Aghānī*, 17: 138. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 188. Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 230. Al-Balādhurī adds that al-Mughīra, after cursing ᶜAlī, said, "He deviated from the Book, left the Sunna of the Prophet, split the unity of the Muslims, shed blood and was killed while he was not innocent." Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 252.

[69] Al-Isfahānī, *Aghānī*, 17: 138. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 252. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 188-9. Unfortunately, no further information on the economic factors of Ḥujr's movement is provided by the sources. Perhaps al-Mughīra was instructed by Muᶜāwiya to deprive ᶜAlī's supporters of their stipends in order to force them to stop opposing the Umayyad officials.

[70] Ibid. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 252. Al-Isfahānī, *Aghānī*, 17: 138.

[71] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 189.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

denying them their stipends and shares was condemned not only by Ḥujr but also by the people of Kūfa.

Al-Mughīra warned Ḥujr of the dreadful consequences of displeasing the ruler, but avoided confrontation with him and his supporters. His associates advised him to take action against Ḥujr and his followers, warning him that his indulgence would undermine his power and infuriate Muᶜāwiya. Al-Mughīra told them that he was not prepared to commit a great sin and, thereby, lose the next world by shedding the blood of the most excellent men of the city for the sake of securing Muᶜāwiya's power in this world, and predicted that Ḥujr would certainly be executed by his successor.[72] Al-Mughīra was probably aware that Ziyād Ibn Abīh (d. 53/679), then the governor of Baṣra, would be the new governor of Kūfa and would take severe measures against Ḥujr. It should be mentioned that al-Mughīra himself admitted that Ḥujr and his supporters were the most excellent men of the city, the shedding of whose blood was forbidden, since they had not committed any crime for which they could be executed. In fact, they were simply demanding the rights of which they had been deprived. However, in order not to bring the wrath of the caliph on his head, al-Mughīra did not stop cursing ᶜAlī and praising ᶜUthmān until the end of his governorship.

Al-Mughīra's successor was Ziyād in 50/670, who governed both Kūfa and Baṣra after al-Mughīra's death, and used to spend his winter in Baṣra and his summer in Kūfa. His deputy in Baṣra was Samura Ibn Jundab (d. 60/679) and his deputy in Kūfa was ᶜAmr Ibn Ḥurayth (d. 85/704), both of whom were leaders of Muᶜāwiya's army.[73] Ziyād Ibn

[72] Ibid. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 253. Al-Isfahānī, *Aghānī*, 17: 139.
[73] Ibid., 17: 140. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 254.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Abīh had been an old friend of Ḥujr's at the time of ᶜAlī when Ziyād was his deputy in Fārs in 37/657. He changed his attitude towards ᶜAlī and became his enemy only when he was won over by Muᶜāwiya, who claimed that he was his bastard brother.[74] In his first speech in Kūfa, Ziyād threatened Ḥujr with severe punishment if he persisted in opposing the Umayyad authorities,[75] but Ḥujr and his followers continued to protest against Muᶜāwiya and his governor in Kūfa while Ziyād was absent. Hearing his speeches and his condemnation of Muᶜāwiya, the people of Kūfa started to rally around Ḥujr.[76] Al-Isfahānī narrates that ᶜImāra Ibn al-Walīd, an ardent supporter of the Umayyads, informed Ziyād about the situation, expecting open revolt on the part of Ḥujr and his followers. Ziyād again summoned Ḥujr and warned him against rebellion.[77] Al-Balādhurī tells us, on the authority of ᶜAwāna, that Ziyād had tried but failed to win over Ḥujr. He was willing to elevate Ḥujr's position on the condition that he would end his support for ᶜAlī's cause and his opposition to the Umayyads.[78] However, Ḥujr's condemnation of Muᶜāwiya's policy ended with an open protest.

What was the main reason for Ḥujr's arrest and execution? According to al-Ṭabarī, on the authority of Muḥammad Ibn Sīrīn (d. 110/728), Ziyād delivered such a long speech in the Friday sermon in the mosque of Kūfa that it went beyond the prayer time. When Ḥujr reminded Ziyād about praying, the latter ignored him and continued his speech, whereupon Ḥujr stoned Ziyād and, joined by the people, started to perform his prayers.

---

[74] Full details of the story of Muᶜāwiya's recognition of Ziyād as his bastard brother is provided by al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 202-3 and al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 3: 6-8. See also al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 163-4. Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 218-9.

[75] Ibid., 2: 230. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 253-4. Al-Isfahānī, *Aghānī*, 17: 140. According to al-Balādhurī, Ziyād threatened several times to shed Ḥujr's blood in case the latter continued opposing the ruler.

[76] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 253-4. Al-Isfahānī, *Aghānī*, 17: 140.

[77] Ibid.

[78] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 251.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Noticing this, Ziyād cut short his speech and started to lead the prayers. When Ziyād wrote to Muᶜāwiya about Ḥujr's protest, Muᶜāwiya ordered him to handcuff Ḥujr and send him to Damascus. Ziyād did so and Muᶜāwiya executed him.[79] For many reasons, this report cannot be accepted. First, Ḥujr, according to this account which is contradicted by other reports, did not protest against the policy of the Umayyad authorities and did not condemn Muᶜāwiya's conduct. Second, it is unlikely that Ḥujr and his companions would have openly opposed Ziyād, who was known for his harsh measures against his opponents. Third, this report was not recorded by any other source.

Another description of these events is narrated by al-Isfahānī, al-Balādhurī and al-Ṭabarī, on the authority of Abū Mikhnaf and ᶜAwāna. During Ziyād's absence, the companions of Ḥujr went repeatedly to the mosque, gathered around him, made known their unflinching support and publicly condemned Muᶜāwiya's policy. Al-Isfahānī's account reveals the large number of ᶜAlī's followers, who used to occupy a third or even half of the mosque of Kūfa.[80] ᶜAmr Ibn Ḥurayth, Ziyād's deputy in Kūfa, urged them to submit and warned them against dissension, but they disregarded his warning and dared to stone him during a Friday sermon, forcing him to take shelter in the governor's palace. ᶜAmr therefore wrote to Ziyād, informing him of the danger of the uprising in Kūfa. Hearing of this open rebellion in the mosque, Ziyād hurried back to Kūfa and, in the presence of Ḥujr and his companions in the mosque, delivered a sermon warning the people of Kūfa not to oppose the authorities. Ziyād threatened Ḥujr with death, setting him as an example to anybody who opposed the ruler.[81]

---

[79] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 190.
[80] Al-Isfahānī, *Aghānī*, 17: 140.
[81] Ibid. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 190. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 254-5.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Ziyād first sent some of his men to summon Ḥujr. However, Ḥujr's companions refused to hand him over. Ziyād now turned to the tribal chiefs, accusing them of sympathy with Ḥujr, and stating, "Your bodies are with me but your hearts are with Ḥujr."[82] Ziyād threatened to attack them with the Syrian forces unless they proved their loyalty to him and withdrew their support from Ḥujr. Afraid of losing their relationship with the governor, thereby forfeiting their benefits,[83] they assured him of their submission and loyalty to the caliph and confirmed their readiness to oppose Ḥujr. Ziyād then ordered them to stop their families and relatives from supporting Ḥujr. Although the majority of Ḥujr's supporters finally deserted him, a large group refused to leave him and tried to prevent his capture.[84]

The significant role of the leaders of the tribes of Kūfa in facilitating the way for the Umayyad officials to subdue Ḥujr's protest and for Ziyād to capture him is further illustrated by al-Ṭabarī. He narrates, on the authority of Abū Mikhnaf, that Ziyād ordered the tribe of Midhḥij and the tribe of Hamadān to gather at the graveyard of Kinda in order to surround Ḥujr and arrest him. Ziyād also instructed the people of Yemen, to whom Ḥujr belonged, to go to the cemetery of al-Ṣā'idiyyīn in order to arrest him.[85]

Finally, Ḥujr remained alone, seeking protection from the tribes, and for a while found shelter by moving from one tribal area to another. Although Ziyād's men followed him, they failed to capture him. Because Ḥujr was protected by the Kūfan tribes, the only way for Ziyād to arrest him was to resort to Ḥujr's tribe Kinda. He therefore threatened to

---

[82] Ibid., 5: 255. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 191. Al-Isfahānī, *Aghānī*, 17: 140-42.
[83] See footnote 69.
[84] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4:191, Al-Isfahānī, *Aghānī*, 17: 140-2. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 255.
[85] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 194.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

kill Muḥammad Ibn al-Ashᶜath (d. 67/686), a prominent leader of the tribe of Kinda, and to destroy his properties unless he arrested Ḥujr. In order to protect his tribes' members from Ziyād's punishment, Ḥujr sent his *mawlā*, Rushayd, to Ibn al-Ashᶜath, offering to surrender voluntarily if Ziyād provided him safe-conduct. Ziyād accepted Ibn al-Ashᶜath's demand and granted Ḥujr safe-conduct. When Ḥujr surrendered, he was imprisoned for ten nights by Ziyād, who was awaiting orders to dispatch him to Muᶜāwiya.[86]

According to the accounts of al-Isfahānī, al-Balādhurī and al-Ṭabarī, the reason for Ḥujr's arrest was his open protest and opposition to Muᶜāwiya's new strategy. He condemned Muᶜāwiya for breaking his promises, for cursing ᶜAlī and for his unjust treatment of the people of Kūfa. Muᶜāwiya's policy was, in fact, the main cause of Ḥujr's protest. The followers of ᶜAlī agreed with Ḥujr's demands, rallying around him and condemning Muᶜāwiya's strategy. Ḥujr insisted on his demands and was not ready to submit to the Umayyad governor. He surrendered only when he did not find enough supporters to confront the Umayyad officials, realizing that his tribesmen would expose themselves to Ziyād's ruthless treatment if they insisted on protecting him.

Ziyād's mission was now to pursue Ḥujr's companions. Some of them had escaped from Kūfa to find shelter in other places, while others were captured and imprisoned. When they refused to agree to Ziyād's demand to curse ᶜAlī, some of Ḥujr's followers

[86] Al-Isfahānī, *Aghānī*, 17: 146-7. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 259. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 195-6.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

were beaten and then imprisoned. Ziyād continued to seek out Ḥujr's supporters until he had gathered twelve of them.[87]

In order to condemn Ḥujr for his protest against the Umayyad officials, Ziyād asked the heads of the four quarters of Kūfa to testify to what they had witnessed with regard to Ḥujr's protest, and they agreed on the following charges: 1) Ḥujr Ibn ᶜAdī had gathered the people around himself; 2) he openly reviled and cursed the caliph; 3) he called the people to fight against the Commander of the Faithful; 4) he believed that the caliphate was not for anyone except the family of ᶜAlī; 5) he expelled the caliph's deputy from Kūfa; 6) he praised ᶜAlī and believed that he was completely innocent of all accusations; he also incited people to condemn the enemies of ᶜAlī and all those who fought against him.[88]

The charges stipulated in this document against Ḥujr by the four chiefs of Kūfa were apparently accurate, reflecting the feelings and actions of the opposition party embodied by Ḥujr and his companions. The charges laid down in the document dealt almost exclusively with Ḥujr's personal point of view – his preference for the house of ᶜAlī and his condemnation of Muᶜāwiya's policy. However, these charges and signatures were insufficient for Ziyād's censure of Ḥujr. In fact, Ziyād was looking for more charges and more witnesses, in order to put the party spokesman to death and to silence the opposition party in Kūfa. After studying the document, he said, "I do not think this condemnation is

[87] Ibid., 4: 198-9. Al-Isfahānī, *Aghānī*, 17: 147-9. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 260-2. Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 231-2. Al-Balādhurī numerates fourteen persons including Ḥujr to be gathered and put in prison by Ziyād. *Ansāb*, 4: 220-1.

[88] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 198-9. Al-Isfahānī, *Aghānī*, p. 149. It should be noted that the charges, 3, 4 and 5 are not recorded by al-Isfahānī. Since al-Isfahānī recorded almost the same account as al-Ṭabarī on the authority of Abū Mikhnaf, either al-Isfahānī omitted these charges or al-Ṭabarī added them . According to al-Madā'inī's account, the charges were that Ḥujr and his companions reviled both ᶜUthmān and Muᶜāwiya and dissociated themselves (*bari'ū minhumā*) from them. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 263.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

decisive enough, I want the attestations of more witnesses than just these four chieftains to be affixed to it."[89] Therefore, another document was arranged by Abū Burda, one of the four chiefs of the four divisions of Kūfa, who dictated the following accusations: 1) Ḥujr Ibn ᶜAdī had denounced his allegiance to the caliph; 2) he defected from the unity of the community; 3) he cursed the caliph; 4) he called for war and created discord; 5) he gathered the people around him and exhorted them to break off allegiance to the Commander of the Faithful and remove him from office; and 6) he did not believe in God.[90] Ziyād was satisfied with these new charges and believed that Ḥujr would be executed. After looking at the accusations, he swore by God that he would do his best to have Ḥujr beheaded.[91]

The difference between the two documents is important. While the first places much emphasis on Ḥujr's views in support of ᶜAlī's cause and devotion to his family, the second replaces these charges with an accusation that Ḥujr had broken his allegiance to the caliph[92] and that he disbelieved in God, both of which entailed his execution. Perhaps some of the charges listed in the second document were fabricated. This explains the report that Muᶜāwiya was hesitant about accepting the indictment and reluctant to take drastic action against Ḥujr.[93] Moreover, as will be seen below, the only condition given by Muᶜāwiya for Ḥujr and his partisans to save their lives was that they must curse and denounce ᶜAlī. This also indicates that their main offence was their faith in ᶜAlī's cause and not crimes against the state and the caliph, as laid down in the second document.

---

[89] Al-Isfahānī, *Aghānī*, 17: 149. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 199.
[90] Ibid., 4: 200. Al-Isfahānī, *Aghānī*, 17: 149. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 262.
[91] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 200. Al-Isfahānī, *Aghānī*, 17: 149.
[92] It should be mentioned that when Ḥujr was brought to Ziyād, he confirmed that he did not break his allegiance to Muᶜāwiya. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 197. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 259.
[93] Ibid., 5: 265. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 203.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Ziyād tried his best to prove the legitimacy of the second document. He summoned the prominent people and the tribal leaders to attest to the authenticity of the indictment, and seventy witnesses put their signature on the document. Al-Mukhtār Ibn Yusuf al-Thaqafī and ᶜUrwa Ibn al-Mughīra did not present themselves so that they would not have to testify to these charges.[94] Some of these signatures were certainly forged. For example, the signature of al-Sarī Ibn Waqqās was written down although he was absent. The prominent *qāḍī* Shurayḥ Ibn al-Ḥārith (d. 50/697), whose testimony would evidently have been most crucial for the governor, protested about the use of false testimony under his name. In his letter to Muᶜāwiya, Shurayḥ argued that he had never signed the document and that his name had been listed without his knowledge. He moreover testified that Ḥujr was a pious Muslim who performed prayer, gave alms, observed the fast of Ramaḍān, practiced the ritual of *ḥajj*, enjoined what was righteous and prohibited what was reprehensible, and whose blood was forbidden to be shed.[95] Shurayḥ Ibn Hānī (d. 78/697), one of the commanders of ᶜAlī's army, protested that his signature was put down without his knowledge.[96]

Ziyād was eager to see Ḥujr exccuted, and sent him and his companions to Damascus. Muᶜāwiya wanted to get rid of the prisoners as soon as possible and, therefore, ordered them to be imprisoned ten miles outside Damascus in a place called Marj ᶜAdhrā'. In fact, Muᶜāwiya hesitated about executing them and sought opinions from the people of Syria concerning the prisoners. Some advised Muᶜāwiya to distribute them

[94] Ibid., 4: 201. Al-Isfahānī, *Aghānī*, 17: 151. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 263.
[95] Ibid., 5: 264. Al-Isfahānī, *Aghānī*, 17: 151. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 202-3.
[96] Ibid., 4: 203. Al-Isfahānī, *Aghānī*, 17: 151.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

around the cities of Syria in order to avoid any rebellion; however, Muᶜāwiya did not listen to them.[97]

Meanwhile Ḥujr, according to al-Ṭabarī and al-Isfahānī, wrote to Muᶜāwiya from prison assuring him that he and his supporters would stand by their oath of allegiance to him and that only their enemies had testified against him. However, Muᶜāwiya ruled that the testimony of his governor, Ziyād, was more accurate than Ḥujr's.[98] In his account, al-Yaᶜqūbī narrates that Ziyād wrote a letter to Muᶜāwiya, urging him to execute Ḥujr and his companions and claiming that Ḥujr and his followers refused to curse ᶜAlī and condemned the Umayyad officials and, therefore, had deserted from submission (*tāᶜah*) to the authorities.[99]

Certain prominent people asked Muᶜāwiya to release their respective clansmen and, in the end, six of the fourteen accused were released. However, Muᶜāwiya did not listen to the advice of his associates, nor did he look at Shurayḥ's testimony concerning Ḥujr. He also refused the intercession of Mālik Ibn Hubayra for Ḥujr's release. The final decision for Ḥujr's fate was in Muᶜāwiya's hands. He intended to give the followers of the family of the Prophet no alternative but to submit to his will. Persisting in not to fulfilling any of his promises, especially with regard to the cursing of ᶜAlī, he ordered that Ḥujr and the other seven be released if they publicly cursed and denounced ᶜAlī; they refused and were thereupon executed.[100]

---

[97] Ibid., 17: 152. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 265. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 203.
[98] Ibid. Al-Isfahānī, *Aghānī*, 17: 154.
[99] Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 230.
[100] Ibid., 2: 230. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 205-6. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 266-7. Al-Isfahānī, *Aghānī*, 17: 155-7. Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 3: 4.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Mu^{c}āwiya, without a legitimate reason to execute Ḥujr, was condemned for his act. Al-Balādhurī tells us that, in his will, Ḥujr asked the people not to remove blood from his body for, he explained, "I will meet Mu^{c}āwiya hereafter; I have killed nobody and I have committed no offense."[101] Surprisingly enough, Ḥujr, according to his own account, was executed in a place where he had been the first Muslim to fight the unbelievers on behalf of Islam.[102]

Ḥujr's execution prompted many people to protest against Mu^{c}āwiya's violation of Islamic norms. For instance, Mālik Ibn Hubayra, whose intervention had failed to release Ḥujr, gathered a large number of his people from Kinda and other tribes in order to avenge Ḥujr's execution, but was again unsuccessful.[103] Al-Balādhurī narrates that when the news of the execution of Ḥujr and his companions reached Khurāsān, al-Rabī^{c} Ibn Ziyād called the people to revolt against Mu^{c}āwiya, but nobody dared to comply with his call.[104] Even ^{c}Ā'isha, the Prophet's widow, and ^{c}Abd Allāh Ibn ^{c}Umar protested vehemently against Ḥujr's execution. In spite of her aversion to ^{c}Alī and his partisans, ^{c}Ā'isha felt that she could not remain silent. She is said to have sent the noble Makhzumite, ^{c}Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn al-Ḥārith, to intercede with Mu^{c}āwiya for Ḥujr and his companions, but he arrived only after the execution had taken place. She condemned Mu^{c}āwiya for killing such a pious man.[105] According to another report, Mu^{c}āwiya paid ^{c}Ā'isha a visit during the pilgrimage. She condemned Mu^{c}āwiya for the murder of Ḥujr

[101] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 270.
[102] Ibid., 5: 271. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 205.
[103] Ibid., 4: 207. Al-Balādhurī, 5: 270.
[104] Ibid., 5: 275-6.
[105] Ibid., 5: 274, 276. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 4: 208.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and his companions and threatened him with revenge.[106] Al-Ṭabarī narrates that al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī considered the killing of Ḥujr as one of the four main pernicious crimes committed by Muᶜāwiya.[107]

The main reason for Ḥujr's execution was not based on committing a crime or an infidelity; he did not commit any grave sin that deserved punishment by death. Muᶜāwiya wanted to apply his own policies and regulations against the followers of ᶜAlī, and a dialogue between Mālik Ibn Hubayra and Muᶜāwiya clearly indicates that the latter killed Ḥujr and his partisans not because of deeds they had performed that justified their murder, but rather to weaken the opposition party that objected to his politics. When Mālik met with Muᶜawiya, he condemned him for killing Ḥujr and his companions, stating that they had not committed a crime that justified the death penalty. Muᶜāwiya admitted that they did not deserve death, but tried to defend himself; he claimed that he had been about to release them, but said that Ziyād had told him in his letter that they were the leaders of the *fitna* (civil strife), so that "I killed them in order to eliminate the *fitna* at its source."[108] Al-Dīnawarī himself confirms that Ḥujr and his companions did not commit any crime. He narrates that Ziyād sent Abū Burda Ibn Abī Mūsā, Shurayḥ and Abū Hunayda al-Qaynī to Muᶜāwiya to be witnesses against Ḥujr and his partisans. They, however, testified before Muᶜāwiya that Ḥujr and his companions had only stoned ᶜAmr Ibn Ḥurayīth; nevertheless, Muᶜāwiya ordered them to be executed.[109]

---

[106] Ibid. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 274. Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 231.
[107] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 208.
[108] Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 224.
[109] Ibid.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The execution of Ḥujr had a far-reaching effect on Muᶜāwiya and put his illegitimate caliphate into question. The people of Kūfa were affected particularly deeply, reacting profoundly because Ḥujr was one of the greatest companions of ᶜAlī as well as their spokesman. They had observed Muᶜāwiya's actions and had come to realize that he would not fulfill any of his promises or adhere to any of his commitments, since he would not stop applying his new policy of cursing ᶜAlī, treating them unjustly and executing anyone who objected to his rule. They realized that their *bayᶜa* to Muᶜāwiya no longer had any meaning, since he had broken all his promises. They had paid allegiance to Muᶜāwiya on condition that he would act according to the Book of God, the Sunna of the Prophet, and the conduct of the Rightly Guided Caliphs. Muᶜāwiya, according to his truce with al-Ḥasan, should have stopped cursing ᶜAlī and should not have done any harm to his followers. Now, since he had not fulfilled any of these conditions and because his caliphate had lost its legitimacy, they decided to pay their homage to the legitimate caliph, and ask him to rise against Muᶜāwiya. For the people of Kūfa, the grandsons of the Prophet were the only persons who were entitled to the caliphate. After his brother's death, al-Ḥusayn was their choice, so they sent a delegation to al-Ḥusayn at Medina, urging him to lead an armed revolt against Muᶜāwiya.

What was al-Ḥusayn's attitude towards Muᶜāwiya's deeds? Taking into account that he had given his homage to Muᶜāwiya, even though he was reluctant to do so, al-Ḥusayn refused their call, advising them, as noted earlier, to stay calm until Muᶜāwiya's death. Al-Ḥusayn also realized that he could not confront Muᶜāwiya with people who had failed his father and his brother in dealing with Muᶜāwiya. He preferred to wait until Muᶜāwiya's death. However, the Kūfans' delegation continued to visit al-Ḥusayn.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Mu^{c}āwiya was alarmed by these delegations to al-Ḥusayn, especially when he received a letter from Marwān Ibn al-Ḥakam, his governor in Medina, warning him that the delegation from Kūfa was staying in Medina and making frequent visits to al-Ḥusayn. Upon receiving this news, Mu^{c}āwiya wrote a threatening letter to al-Ḥusayn, reminding him of his *bay^{c}a* and warning him against discord.[110] In fact, Mu^{c}āwiya was afraid that al-Ḥusayn, after Ḥujr's execution and the frequent demands of the Kūfans to rise against Mu^{c}āwiya, might break his allegiance to him and comply with the delegation from Kūfa. Although al-Ḥusayn in his reply told Mu^{c}āwiya that he had no intention of breaking his allegiance or fighting him, he condemned Mu^{c}āwiya and blamed him for breaking his commitments and for his crimes against innocent people. Al-Ḥusayn also condemned and blamed Mu^{c}āwiya for his severe measures against Ḥujr and his companions, and for divergence from the conduct of the Prophet. He wrote:

> Are you not the one who killed Ḥujr, brother of Kinda, and those who are the pious men, who condemn injustice? You killed them after you gave them a guarantee that you would not execute them; have you not killed ^{c}Amr Ibn al-Ḥamiq al-Khuzā^{c}ī (d. 53/672), the friend of the Prophet and a pious man, after you granted him safe-conduct? Have you not claimed falsely that Ziyād Ibn Sumayya was your father's son? And in this you have deliberately deviated from the Sunna of the Prophet and followed your own desire... Have you not killed al-Ḥaḍramī (d. 53/672) just because he was following the religion of ^{c}Alī and the religion of ^{c}Alī is the religion of his cousin Muḥammad, because of whom you are sitting in your place.[111]

In order to secure the *bay^{c}a* of the people of Kūfa, Mu^{c}āwiya had told al-Ḥasan to write down whatever conditions he wished. Once he had gained the Kūfans' recognition of his caliphate, Mu^{c}āwiya declared that he would not fulfill any of his commitments.

---

[110] Ibid., pp. 224-5. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2: 744. Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 2: 180-1.
[111] Full details of Mu^{c}āwiya's letter and al-Ḥusayn's reply is recorded by al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 128-30. See also Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 2: 180-1. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, pp. 224-5

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Moreover, he did not follow the Book of God and the Sunna of the Prophet, but rather applied his own policy. Cursing ᶜAlī and treating the people of Kūfa unjustly with regard to their stipends aroused them to rally around their spokesman, Ḥujr, and protest openly against Muᶜāwiya's new strategy. Although they did not commit any crime, Ḥujr and his followers were killed by Muᶜāwiya.

Even though Ḥujr's protest was aborted and he was, consequently, executed, he had encouraged the people of Kūfa to criticize Muᶜāwiy's policy openly and thereby call his caliphate into question. Because of Ḥujr's objection to Muᶜāwiya's new strategy of treating the people of Kūfa unfairly and breaking all of his promises to al-Ḥasan, and furthermore because of Ḥujr's execution, the Kūfans decided to break their allegiance to Muᶜāwiya and ask al-Ḥusayn to lead them against him. In fact, Ḥujr's protest paved the way for al-Ḥusayn to lead his movement against the Umayyad officials. Al-Ḥusayn now became their leader and they awaited his word. However, from his letter to al-Ḥusayn, Muᶜāwiya was not unaware of the fact that al-Ḥusayn was the obvious choice of the people of Kūfa as the new leader. He had been afraid that the Kūfans would ask al-Ḥusayn to rise against him, but now, after receiving al-Ḥusayn's letter, he was contented that al-Ḥusayn would not comply with their request. However, as the grandson of the Prophet, the potential leader of the Kūfans and the spokesman of the opposition party, al-Ḥusayn was still a great threat for Muᶜāwiya.

Therefore, in this chapter, we have seen how Muᶜāwiya was able to impose his caliphate on the people, even though he did not have the necessary qualifications. What was most important was his use of the *bayᶜa* to oblige people to be loyal to him no matter

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

what he might do. In the next chapter, we will see how he would go on to use the *bayᶜa* to secure the caliphate for his son Yazīd. Nevertheless, we will also see the mounting tension between the Umayyads and al-Ḥusayn. Although al-Ḥusayn could not take his pledge of allegiance away from Muᶜāwiya, he would not be able to allow this transformation of the caliphate to go on under Yazīd.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER TWO

Part One: Muᶜāwiya's Attempts to Secure Yazīd's Accession

Al-Ḥasan, as mentioned earlier, conceded his right to the caliphate and came to terms with Muᶜāiwya only when he had received promises that he would carry out all of the conditions agreed upon in the truce. However, Muᶜāwiya, as shown in Chapter One, disavowed these conditions one by one. He did not desist from cursing ᶜAlī, he persecuted his followers and treated them unjustly. This led him to be strongly condemned by Ḥujr and his supporters, resulting in their execution. Because Muᶜāwiya broke his promises and pursued and executed ᶜAlī's followers, the people of Kūfa started to break their allegiance to Muᶜāwiya and asked al-Ḥusayn to lead them against him. Al-Ḥusayn advised them to wait until Muᶜāwiya's death. Muᶜāwiya, however, continued to carry out his own plans; he refrained from acting according to the Book of God, the Sunna of the Prophet and the conduct of the Rightly Guided Caliphs and adhered to his own discretion.

One of the most important conditions that al-Ḥasan was concerned about was the issue of the succession to the caliphate after Muᶜāwiya's demise. Al-Ḥasan perhaps was not unaware of Muᶜāwiya's ambitions to the caliphate and his plans to transform it to a kingship (*mulk*). In order to protect the caliphate from any deviation, al-Ḥasan imposed the condition on Muᶜāwiya that he had no right to nominate a successor. As mentioned previously, the caliphate, according to some sources, should be restored to al-Ḥasan or,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

according to others, should be left to be decided by consultation. In spite of Muᶜāwiya's acceptance of this major condition, his plan was to perpetuate the caliphate in his house and to nominate his son Yazīd as his successor. For this, Muᶜāwiya had to eliminate al-Ḥasan's claim. In fact, Muᶜāwiya not only wanted to remove al-Ḥasan but also intended to eliminate all rivals to the caliphate in order to pave the way for Yazīd's accession.

The majority of our sources report that the cause of al-Ḥasan's death was poisoning by one of his wives, Jaᶜda, daughter of al-Ashᶜath Ibn Qays, at the instigation of Muᶜāwiya. Muᶜāwiya is reported to have promised her a large sum of money and to marry her to his son Yazīd if she would poison al-Ḥasan.[1] Al-Masᶜūdī reports that, prior to his death in, al-Ḥasan declared that Muᶜāwiya had achieved his desire by poisoning him.[2] According to some sources, al-Ḥasan was poisoned several times.[3]

Muᶜāwiya's role in al-Ḥasan's death, according to al-Isfahānī, was well-known at the time. He narrates that it was reported that the people generally believed that Muᶜāwiya poisoned both al-Ḥasan and Saᶜd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ, one of the most famous Companions of the Prophet, in the same year.[4] Muᶜāwiya's reaction to al-Ḥasan's death may provide further evidence of his significant role in al-Ḥasan's death (50/670). It is reported that upon receiving the news of al-Ḥasan's death, Muᶜāwiya could not hide his feelings of relief and even joy. Moreover, he informed Ibn ᶜAbbās that al-Ḥasan had died from drinking honey.[5] According to this report, Muᶜāwiya perhaps was the first to hear about

---

[1] Ibn Saᶜd, *Tarjama*, p. 84. Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 2: 427. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 295. Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, p. 80. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 318-9. Ibn Aᶜtham narrates that Marwān Ibn al-Ḥakam was the mediator between Muᶜāwiya and al-Ḥasan's wife, Jaᶜda.
[2] Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 2: 427.
[3] Ibn Saᶜd, *Tarjamat*, p. 96. Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 2: 427. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 295. Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, p. 81. Surprisingly enough, al-Ṭabarī does not mention the cause of al-Ḥasan's death.
[4] Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, p. 73.
[5] Ibn Saᶜd, *Tarjama*, p. 95. Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 225-6. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 222.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

al-Ḥasan's demise and the way he died, such awareness providing further proof of Muᶜāwiya's involvement in al-Ḥasan's death.

While Muᶜāwiya seized the opportunity of al-Ḥasan's death to accomplish his plans to secure Yazīd's nomination to the caliphate, ᶜAlī's followers in Kūfa made a bid to restore the caliphate to the house of the family of the Prophet (*ahl al-bayt*). As soon as they heard the news of al-Ḥasan's death, they held a meeting and wrote a letter to al-Ḥusayn, inviting him to rise against Muᶜāwiya. Al-Ḥusayn, honoring his brother's truce with Muᶜāwiya, once again refused to respond to their call and advised them to refrain from rebellion and to stay calm as long as Muᶜāwiya was alive.[6]

Muᶜāwiya was aware of the fact that the people of Kūfa would choose al-Ḥusayn as their leader after al-Ḥasan's death. He also realized that unlike al-Ḥusayn, the only remaining candidate from the Prophet's family, his cousin, ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn ᶜAbbās had no aspiration to the caliphate and would not be the preference of the people of Kūfa as long as al-Ḥusayn was alive. He tried his best to deprive al-Ḥusayn of his right to the caliphate and the leadership of ᶜAlī's followers, pointing out that Ibn ᶜAbbās had now became the lord of the Banū Hāshim. Ibn ᶜAbbās realized Muᶜāwiya's intention of eliminating al-Ḥusayn and confirmed to him that al-Ḥusayn indeed was the lord of the Banū Hāshim. Ibn ᶜAbbās declared, "So long as Abū ᶜAbd Allāh (the nickname of al-Ḥusayn) is alive, surely I am not the lord of the Banū Hāshim."[7]

The most important task for Muᶜāwiya before his death was to strengthen the basis of the caliphate of his son Yazīd, who, because of his immorality, was opposed by a large

---

[6] Ibid., p. 220. Ibn Saᶜd, *Tarjama*, p. 54. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 366.
[7] Ibn Saᶜd, *Tarjama*, p. 95. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 298-9. Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 226.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

group of Muslims.[8] Even some of his supporters in Damascus and governors opposed Muᶜāwiya's nomination of Yazīd as his successor. It is significant to mention that, immediately after the news of al-Ḥasan's death, Muᶜāwiya began to carry out his plan.[9] The questions to be considered at this juncture are: Did Muᶜāwiya succeed in persuading people to accept Yazīd's accession? What devices did he resort to? It was not to be an easy task for Muᶜāwiya and he had to tread with great caution and utilize different devices to achieve his goal. Persuading Muslims to accept Yazīd, who lacked the qualifications for the caliphate, was extremely difficult and Muᶜāwiya had to employ various schemes. For instance, he tried to portray Yazīd as a righteous person, giving the people of Mecca and Medina money and employing poets to describe Yazīd as a pious man who followed in the footsteps of the Prophet.[10]

Muᶜāwiya also had to remove any rivals to Yazīd. Realizing that the Syrians were his real support and that the matter of succession would not be decided without them, Muᶜāwiya informed the Syrians that he was getting old and wished to appoint a successor. When he asked them whom they would consider suitable for this office, they named ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn Khālid Ibn al-Walīd (d. 46/664), one of the loyal commanders of his army. Muᶜāwiya was expecting them to mention Yazīd, but now realized that ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān was an unexpected rival of Yazīd, and therefore, decided to get rid of him. After his arrival from the regular summer campaign in Anatolia, one of ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān's slaves served him a poisoned drink prepared by Muᶜāwiya's Christian physician Ibn

[8] Both al-Masᶜūdī and al-Balādhurī dedicate a section describing Yazīd's conduct in violation of Islamic norms. Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 3: 67-8. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 299-301. Al-Balādhurī states that Yazīd was the first caliph who violated Islamic norms publicly.
[9] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 312. Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Taᶜrīkh*, 2: 228.
[10] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 333-4.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Uthāl, at the instigation of Muᶜāwiya himself, and thus easily disposed of a potential rival.[11]

In fact, one of the most vigorous devices that Muᶜāwiya used to accomplish his mission of securing Yazīd's accession was to poison his competitors. Al-Isfahānī tells us that when Muᶜāwiya prepared to nominate Yazīd as his successor, he decided to remove his rivals and therefore poisoned al-Ḥasan and Saᶜd Ibn Abī al-Waqqāṣ.[12] Muᶜāwiya summarized his method – using honey to poison his enemies – by stating that, "God has soldiers made of honey."[13] In this way, Muᶜāwiya paved the way for Yazīd's succession.

Although Muᶜāwiya intended to secure Yazid's accession, he did not expose his desire publicly, expecting that he would be disappointed by his associates. Muᶜāwiya dared to announce his desire only when his governor of Kūfa, al-Mughīra, mentioned Yazīd as his successor.[14] Al-Mughīra developed this idea to win the favor of Muᶜāwiya and Muᶜāwiya seized this opportunity to expose his intention to the people. Many sources report that Muᶜāwiya decided to replace al-Mughīra with Saᶜīd Ibn al-ᶜĀṣ (d. 59/679) as the new governor of Kūfa. When al-Mughīra heard of this, he went to Damascus and suggested to Yazīd that he was the most qualified person for his father's succession. Hearing this from Yazīd, Muᶜāwiya was delighted and decided to reappoint al-Mughīra to his office, urging him to work for guaranteeing the Kūfans' recognition of Yazīd's accession. Realizing that Muᶜāwiya was aware of the difficulties of this, al-Mughīra assured him that he would secure the allegiance of the people of Kūfa and that Ziyād,

---

[11] Al-Ṭabarī, on the authority of Maslama Ibn Muḥārib, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 171. Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 223.
[12] Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, p. 74.
[13] Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 2: 410. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 168. According to some sources, when Mālik al-Ashtar (d. 38/658) was nominated by ᶜAlī as the governor of Egypt, he was murdered by a drink of poisoned honey at the instigation of Muᶜāwiya. Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 2: 409. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 167-8. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 71-2.
[14] Contrary to all other sources, Ibn Aᶜtham reports that ᶜAmr Ibn al-Āṣ was the first to propose to Muᶜāwiya the idea of nominating Yazīd as his successor. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 322.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

then the governor of Baṣra, would secure it from the people of Baṣra, telling him, "After these two *miṣrs* (towns) nobody could go against you."[15]

In order to further impress Muᶜāwiya, al-Mughīra, according to al-Yaᶜqūbī, also revealed to him that he had already called the chiefs of the tribes of Kūfa to pay homage to Yazīd and they had complied with his call.[16] In fact, al-Mughīra's statement was false since the Kūfan tribal leaders had refused to acknowledge Yazīd's succession, as we will see later. Al-Mughīra actually made the fake claim to Muᶜāwiya in order to remain in his office. This is indicated by al-Yaᶜqūbī's account that when al-Mughīra returned to Kūfa, he told his secretary that he had implicated Muᶜāwiya in a deep scandal from which he could not be saved except by bloodshed.[17] According to this report, this means that the people of Kūfa, contrary to al-Mughīra's claim, would not accept Yazīd's accession and, consequently, their refusal would result in bloodshed. This report also indicates clearly that al-Mughīra believed that Yazīd was not qualified for the caliphate and that the people of Kūfa, therefore, would not regard him as a legitimate caliph and, consequently, would protest against his nomination. By nominating Yazīd to this important office Muᶜāwiya was putting himself in disgrace and bringing severe consequences to all Muslims. However, as soon as al-Mughīra arrived in Kūfa, he started working for Yazīd's benefit, summoning supporters of the Umayyads' newly emerging dynasty and calling on them to pay homage to Yazīd.[18]

Muᶜāwiya was aware of the fact that his son Yazīd was not qualified for this important office and he was afraid that even his own supporters would refuse to comply

---

[15] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 224. Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 165. Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 219-20. Instead of Saᶜīd, al-Yaᶜqūbī mentions ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn Kurayz.
[16] Ibid., 2: 220.
[17] Ibid.
[18] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 224.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

with his idea. Therefore, Muᶜāwiya, according to al-Yaᶜqūbī, wrote to his governor of Baṣra, Ziyād Ibn Abīh, asking him to get allegiance from the people of Baṣra for Yazīd. Ziyād was not satisfied with Muᶜāwiya's decision and was conscious of the fact that Yazīd was not entitled to the caliphate. For this reason, he refused Muᶜāwiya's demand, explaining that Yazīd used to spend his time playing with dogs, monkeys and singing; "he is addicted to wine, while among them are more pious persons, such as al-Ḥusayn, Ibn ᶜAbbās, Ibn al-Zubayr and Ibn ᶜUmar." Ziyād, therefore, advised Muᶜāwiya to instruct his son to behave like these nobles of Quraysh for one or two years in order to be acknowledged by the masses.[19] Al-Ṭabarī also reports, on the authority of Maslama, that Ziyād refused Muᶜāwiya's demand to work for Yazīd's accession. He explained his refusal by describing Yazīd as a neglectful person who devoted himself to hunting. Ziyād also believed that because of Yazīd's dissolution and his breaking of Islamic codes, the people would not acknowledge his succession to the caliphate. Ziyād, therefore, suggested to Yazīd that he abandon his abominable deeds in order to facilitate Muᶜāwiya's task of nominating him as his successor.[20]

It is clear that even Muᶜāwiya's deputies in Kūfa and Baṣra were conscious of the fact that Yazīd was not qualified to the caliphate because of his improper conduct. They were also aware that not only the people of Kūfa but also the people of Mecca and Medina would not accept his accession while some more prominent and nobler persons were still alive. Nevertheless, Muᶜāwiya disregarded his supporters' suggestions, insisting on carrying out his plan to impose his decision on the people.

---

[19] Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 220.
[20] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 224-5.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Ibn A^{c}tham tells us that Mu^{c}āwiya wrote to all of his deputies in his provinces, asking them to take allegiance to Yazīd from the people. Marwān Ibn al-Ḥakam, Sa^{c}īd Ibn al-^{c}Āṣ and ^{c}Abd Allāh Ibn ^{c}Āmir Ibn Kurayz, the most reliable supporters of the Umayyad family, advised Mu^{c}āwiya to keep his desire unexposed until he had verified the Medinans' position. They had surely realized that the people of Mecca and Medina, whose approval of Yazīd's accession was very important to Mu^{c}āwiya, would not recognize Yazīd's caliphate since some of the sons of the Companions of the Prophet who were more entitled to the caliphate than Yazīd were still alive. Accepting their advice, Mu^{c}āwiya tried to win over the people of Mecca and Medina by bestowing a lot of money on them.[21]

Did Mu^{c}āwiya succeed in his mission to win over the people of Mecca and Medina by this means? Ibn A^{c}tham narrates that some of them kept silent and did not show their opposition to Yazīd's succession, whereas others protested against this nomination. Ibn A^{c}tham also tells us that the poet of Baṣra, ^{c}Uqayba Ibn Hubayra al-Asadī, and the poet of Kūfa, ^{c}Abd Allāh Ibn Humām al-Salūlī, who used to criticize Yazīd's misdeeds in their poetry, reluctantly recognized Yazīd's succession. Apparently, Mu^{c}āwiya had succeeded in buying their silence by granting them money.[22]

Knowing that many people were dissatisfied with his plan to secure Yazīd's succession, Mu^{c}āwiya resorted to various methods to win them to his idea. He worked hard, according to al-Ya^{c}qūbī, to follow Ziyād's suggestion to depict Yazīd as a pious

[21] Ibn A^{c}tham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 333.
[22] Ibid. 2: 333-4.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

man, but all of his efforts were in vain because Yazīd's character was beyond redemption.[23]

Ziyād had advised Muᶜāwiya to postpone the nomination of Yazīd and, after Ziyād's death, Muᶜāwiya summoned his leaders and supporters from all the provinces for a special meeting in Damascus to discuss Yazīd's succession. At this meeting, Muᶜāwiya wanted his close associates to make his Syrian supporters acknowledge Yazīd's accession by any means. Therefore, prior to the meeting, Muᶜāwiya ordered al-Ḍaḥḥāk Ibn Qays, the leader of the Damascus army, to take his side and urge the people of Syria to swear allegiance to Yazīd. Muᶜāwiya also instructed ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn ᶜUthmān al-Thaqafī, ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn Masᶜada al-Fazārī, Thawr Ibn Maᶜan al-Salamī, and ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn ᶜIṣām al-Shaᶜrī, his close associates and prominent persons in Damascus, to comply with al-Ḍaḥḥāk's call. During the meeting, Muᶜāwiya pointed out that the people should submit to the orders of their rulers and mentioned Yazīd's entitlement to the caliphate, his merits and knowledge in politics, and called the participants to pay homage to him. Then al-Ḍaḥḥāk, as instructed by Muᶜāwiya, interrupted Muᶜāwiya, confirming that the people should have a caliph after Muᶜāwiya's death and urged Muᶜāwiya to nominate his son for this office. Some other prominent persons agreed with al-Ḍaḥḥāk's words and talked in the same vein.[24]

It seems that the people who were present at the meeting did not comply with al-Ḍaḥḥāk's call and were not willing to pay homage to Yazīd; they kept silent until they were threatened, as indicated by some accounts. Al-Masᶜūdī and Ibn Qutayba tell us that al-Aḥnaf Ibn Qays, one of the prominent Iraqi leaders in Baṣra whose approval of Yazīd's

---

[23] Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 229.
[24] Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 165-8. Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 3: 27. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 336-7.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

succession was important to Muᶜāwiya, opposed Yazīd's nomination to the caliphate and refused to pay homage to him, advising Muᶜāwiya to be cautious in his decision. He also advised Muᶜāwiya not to impose his own desire on the people and to look for the benefit of the community in nominating his successor.[25] The refusal of the Iraqī leaders to comply with Muᶜāwiya's decision is further confirmed by al-Masᶜūdī and Ibn Qutayba's accounts. They both narrate that al-Ḍaḥḥāk in his speech condemned the Iraqi leaders' refusal to acknowledge Yazīd's succession and threatened them with death; ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn ᶜUthmān, one of Muᶜāwiya's prominent supporters, followed in the footsteps of al-Ḍaḥḥāk.[26]

Ibn Aᶜtham also narrates that a man from Medina called Muḥammad Ibn ᶜAmr objected to Yazīd's succession and asked Muᶜāwiya to be God-fearing in nominating a leader over the Prophet's community.[27] In his very brief account, Khalīfa, whose narration usually reflects a pro-Umayyad viewpoint and whose authorities for this account are unknown, reports that when Muᶜāwiya called the people of *Shām* to pay homage to Yazīd in 50/670 they responded positively and paid allegiance to him.[28]

According to Ibn Aᶜtham, Ibn Qutayba and al-Masᶜūdī, Muᶜāwiya's call for Yazīd's succession after al-Ḥasan's death in 50/670 did not pass without opposition: the leaders of the Iraqis, who had been called by Muᶜāwiya to Damascus in order to witness Yazīd's nomination, refused to acknowledge his accession. This opposition is further confirmed by Ibn Qutayba, who narrates full details of the events.

---

[25] Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 3: 27-8. Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 169-70.
[26] Ibid. Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 3: 27-8. According to al-Masᶜūdī, the Syrians paid homage to Yazīd in 56/676.
[27] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 336.
[28] Khalīfa, *Ta'rīkh*, p. 159.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Realizing that both the people of Ḥijāz and Iraq believed that the family of the Prophet were more entitled to the caliphate than anyone else, al-Aḥnaf, according to Ibn Qutayba, affirmed that they would not accept Yazīd's caliphate as long as al-Ḥasan was alive. He also reminded Muᶜāwiya of his agreement that the caliphate should be restored to al-Ḥasan after Muᶜāwiya's death. Furthermore, al-Aḥnaf threatened Muᶜāwiya by the swords of the Iraqi people if he did not fulfill his promises. However, al-Aḥnaf's speech provoked the anger of the Syrian leaders, who reproached him for his words and supported Muᶜāwiya's nomination of Yazīd. Hearing al-Aḥnaf's disapproval of his decision, Muᶜāwiya tried to put an end to the disagreement by threatening whoever opposed his decision. Finally, Abū Khanīfa, another supporter of Muᶜāwiya, put an end to the meeting. He pulled out his sword and said, "You are the Commander of the Faithful; if you die Yazīd will succeed you," pointing to Muᶜāwiya. "Whoever does not acknowledge this fact, this will be for him," pointing to his sword. [29]

Ibn Aᶜtham and al-Masᶜūdī support Ibn Qutayba's account by narrating that an ardent supporter of Muᶜāwiya stood up and said: "O people! The Commander of the Faithful is this one," and he pointed to Muᶜāwiya, "his heir is this one," pointing to Yazīd; "If anyone refuses I will use this," pointing to his sword. At this point, the people started to pay homage to Yazīd.[30] According to the above-mentioned accounts, the people refused to acknowledge Yazīd's nomination and they did so only when they were threatened with death. For this reason and due to al-Aḥnaf's refusal to acknowledge Yazīd's succession,

---

[29] Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 169-70. It should be noted that, according to this account, the meeting was held before al-Ḥasan's death. However, the exact date is not recorded by Ibn Qutayba. It should be also mentioned that usually the sources are not in agreement in regards to the dates.

[30] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 337. In his account, Ibn Aᶜtham mentions the name of the person as Yazīd Ibn al-Muqannaᶜ al-Kindī. Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 3: 28. Al-Masᶜūdī does not mention Ibn al-Muqannaᶜ in his account, instead he says a man from the Azd.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the meeting failed, and, according to Ibn Qutayba, Muᶜāwiya avoided mentioning Yazid's succession until he visited Medina in the year 50 A.H.[31] Muᶜāwiya realized that he could not secure Yazīd's accession from the people of Ḥijāz unless he won over the prominent nobles in Medina, and this could not be achieved unless he went himself to Medina. Therefore, he decided to visit Medina in order to inform these men about his decision in regards to Yazīd's nomination and to test their viewpoint.

According to Ibn Qutayba, as soon as Muᶜāwiya reached Medina he sent for ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn ᶜAbbās, ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn Jaᶜfar, ᶜAbd Allah Ibn al-Zubayr and ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn ᶜUmar for a close meeting. Muᶜāwiya informed them about his choice and asked them to reply favorably. Ibn ᶜAbbās and Ibn Jaᶜfar insisted that the caliphate should be restored to the family of the Prophet. Moreover, Ibn Jaᶜfar told Muᶜāwiya that if he followed the Qur'ān, the Sunna of the Prophet and the conduct of Abū Bakr and ᶜUmar he would find that nobody was more entitled to the caliphate than the family of the Prophet. In his reply, Ibn al-Zubayr mentioned that the caliphate should remain within those people of Quraysh who enjoy high-quality conducts (*afᶜāl marḍiyya*) and outstanding ancestors, and that Muᶜāwiya lacks these qualifications. In his turn, Ibn ᶜUmar protested that the caliphate was not a kingship to be transferred from fathers to sons, arguing that, otherwise, he, Ibn ᶜUmar, should have succeeded the caliphate after his father's death, which he did not. When Muᶜāwiya realized that some of the most prominent nobles in Medina insisted on rejecting Yazīd's succession, he decided to return to Damascus, desisting from mentioning Yazīd's succession until al-Ḥasan's death.[32]

---

[31] Ibn Qutayba, 1: 72.
[32] Ibid., 1: 172-4.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

This account requires some comment: (1) the name of al-Ḥusayn, the most influential Hāshimite noble and whose approval of Yazīd's succession was extremely important to Muᶜāwiya because of his leading position among the people, does not appear in this account; (2) it is unlikely that Ibn Jaᶜfar, ᶜAlī's nephew and an ardent supporter of the Banū Hāshim, would mention the conduct of ᶜUmar and Abū Bakr but ignore ᶜAlī's; and (3) it is unlikely and contrary to all other accounts that Ibn ᶜUmar, who used to avoid any confrontation with the Umayyad authorities, would answer Muᶜāwiya with such aggressive words. Perhaps some details of this account are exaggerated and, as a result, cannot be accepted. Even if Ibn Qutayba's report is invalid, the fact remains that Yazīd's succession could not be accomplished unless the *bayᶜa* was taken from the prominent nobles in Medina, especially al-Ḥusayn, whose entitlement to the caliphate was upheld by the people of Kūfa and Ḥijāz. Muᶜāwiya realized that if al-Ḥusayn paid homage to Yazīd, his *bayᶜa* would be binding on him, just as his *bayᶜa* to Muᶜāwiya at the time of al-Ḥasan had been. Therefore, al-Ḥusayn would not be able to revoke his homage to Yazīd by announcing his entitlement to the caliphate, even if the people of Kūfa called him to rise against Muᶜāwiya.

Concerning the importance of the *bayᶜa*, al-Ṭabāṭabā'ī (d. 1402/1981), the prominent 20th century Shīᶜī scholar from Iran, says, "Paying homage (*bayᶜa*) was an old Arab practice, which was carried out in important matters such as kingship and governorship." When the people gave their *bayᶜa* to their king or prince, according to al-Ṭabāṭabā'ī, they showed their support for his actions. Violating the *bayᶜa* was considered a disgraceful and dishonorable act.[33] This explains why al-Ḥusayn refused to answer the calls of the Kūfans

[33] Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Ṭabāṭabā'ī, *Shīᶜa*, tr. by Ḥusayn Naṣr. Qum: Anṣāriyyān Publication, 2000, pp. 196-7. See also E. Tyan, "Bayᶜa," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 1: 1113-4.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to rise against Mu^{c}āwiya after al-Ḥasan's death, mentioning that he had given his pledge of allegiance to Mu^{c}āwiya; it also explains why Yazīd's succession could not be legitimate without the *bay^{c}a* of the prominent nobles.

Medina was the most important province Mu^{c}āwiya needed to secure the acknowledgment of Yazīd's succession, since it was the residence of most of the prominent nobles, followers of the Companions of the Prophet (Ṣaḥāba) and sons of the Ṣaḥāba. The questions to be considered here are: Did Mu^{c}āwiya eventually win over the people of Medina to acknowledge Yazīd's caliphate? Did they pay homage to Yazīd willingly or were they forced by Mu^{c}āwiya to do so?

After managing, with the help of his leaders of the other provinces, to secure Yazīd's succession from the people, Mu^{c}āwiya was now more concerned about winning the allegiance of the prominent nobles of Medina. The most important were the four sons of the Ṣaḥāba: namely, al-Ḥusayn Ibn ^{c}Alī, ^{c}Abd Allāh Ibn ^{c}Umar, ^{c}Abd Allāh Ibn al-Zubayr and ^{c}Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Abī Bakr. In order to establish the legitimacy of Yazīd's succession, Mu^{c}āwiya had to secure the acknowledgement of these four persons, and without their approval, his task could not be accomplished. Therefore, before coming to Medina, Mu^{c}āwiya wrote to his governor, Marwān Ibn al-Ḥakam, informing him that the people of Egypt, Syria and Iraq had paid homage to Yazīd, and ordered him to pay homage to Yazīd also and secure the allegiance of the people of Medina. Upon receiving the letter, according to Ibn A^{c}tham, Marwān asked the people of Medina to assemble in the mosque, and informed them about Mu^{c}āwiya's choice to nominate Yazīd as his successor, asking them to pledge their allegiance to him. Knowing Yazīd's character and his violation of Islamic norms, the people of Medina fell silent and nobody complied with

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Marwān's call. ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn Abī Bakr openly objected to Marwān's call, stating that, "Yazīd is an unfit character to us, but Muᶜāwiya wants to transform the caliphate into *hirqaliyya* (Byzantine polity)." The discussion between ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān and Marwān then became a verbal fight.[34] At this time, Marwān failed to secure Yazīd's succession from the people of Medina.[35]

Ibn Qutayba, on the other hand, tells us that when he received Muᶜāwiya's letter, Marwān himself as well as the people of Quraysh refused to acknowledge Yazīd's succession. He wrote to Muᶜāwiya informing him that his people (the Qurayshites) refused to comply with his call to acknowledge Yazīd's succession. Upon receiving Marwān's letter, Muᶜāwiya decided to overthrow Marwān from his office and nominate Saᶜīd Ibn ᶜĀṣ in his place.[36]

Protesting against Muᶜāwiya's nomination of Yazīd, according to Ibn Qutayba and al-Masᶜūdī, Marwān went to Damascus with some of his associates in order to persuade Muᶜāwiya to change his decision. Mentioning Yazīd's unsuitability for the caliphate, Marwān advised Muᶜāwiya to be cautious in promoting young people (*ṣibyān*) like Yazīd [who has no experience in the matter of the caliphate] to the leadership of Muslims.[37] Marwān, who had immense experience with the caliphate, having been ᶜUthmān's secretary and carried out superior service to the benefit of the Umayyad dynasty, perhaps had his own great ambitions to the caliphate and believed that he was more qualified and entitled than Yazīd, who had no experience for such an important office. Muᶜāwiya realized Marwān's ambition and, according to al-Masᶜūdī, succeeded in winning over

---

[34] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 338-9. See also al-Isfahānī, *Aghānī*, 17: 375.
[35] It should be mentioned again that the dates of Muᶜāwiya's attempts to secure Yazīd's succession occurred after al-Hasan's death in 50/670. However, the exact dates of the events are unknown in our sources.
[36] Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 175-6.
[37] Ibid., 1: 176-7. Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 3: 28.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Marwān by assuring him that he would be Yazīd's successor, but he failed to fulfill his promise.[38] Ibn Qutayba, on the other hand, tells us that Muᶜāwiya wanted to buy Marwān's silence; he narrates that Muᶜāwiya won over Marwān by assigning him a thousand dinars every month and a hundred dinars for everyone in his family.[39]

In another account, Ibn Qutayba reports that Muᶜāwiya dismissed Marwān from his office because he had failed to fulfill his duties and nominated Saᶜīd Ibn al-Āṣ as the new governor of Medina. This time, Muᶜāwiya took new measures for securing Yazīd's succession from the people of Medina. He wrote to his new governor in Medina, ordering him to call the people to acknowledge Yazid's succession and to take severe measures against whoever refused to submit to the caliph's orders. Saᶜīd called the people of Medina to pay homage to Yazīd, threatening and forcing them and showing rudeness. In spite of Saᶜīd's insolence, most of the people did not respond to his call, especially the Banū Hāshim: none of them responded. Ibn al-Zubayr strongly condemned Yazīd's succession. Having failed to get homage from the people of Medina, even by threatening them, Saᶜīd wrote to Muᶜāwiya, informing him that he had no power over the people of Medina and that homage to Yazīd could not be obtained except by "using horses and men or by coming yourself."[40]

It is obvious that the people of Medina stood firm against Yazīd's caliphate and that the new governor failed in his task. Moreover, he realized that this matter would not be finished unless Muᶜāwiya came with his troops and forced the people to pay homage to Yazīd. Whether Marwān or Saᶜīd was the governor of Medina, the fact remained that the people of Medina refused to comply with the governor's call, and Muᶜāwiya realized that

[38] Ibid., 3: 29.
[39] Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 177.
[40] Ibid. The exact dates of these events are not recorded by Ibn Qutayba.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

he could not secure their allegiance to Yazīd's succession unless he came to Medina himself and took new measures.

Before doing so, Muᶜāwiya tried to resort to another scheme; he turned to the most influential nobles in order to persuade them to acknowledge Yazīd's accession. Ibn Qutayba reports that Muᶜāwiya wrote four letters: to Ibn ᶜAbbās, Ibn al-Zubayr, Ibn Jaᶜfar and al-Ḥusayn, ordering and threatening them to submit to his decision, or face severe consequences.

Trying to force Ibn ᶜAbbās to pay homage to Yazīd, Muᶜāwiya resorted to charges against ᶜAlī's supporters. He accused Ibn ᶜAbbās of having participated in the killing of the third caliph, ᶜUthmān, and wrote, "I have been told that you are slow in giving *bayᶜa* to Yazīd. I have the right to kill you, because you urged the people against ᶜUthmān." Muᶜāwiya then ordered Ibn ᶜAbbās to hurry to the mosque of Medina to curse those who had killed ᶜUthmān and to pay homage to Yazīd publicly.[41]

Muᶜāwiya also accused Ibn Jaᶜfar of doing "bad things," although he did not mention them. In his letter to Ibn Jaᶜfar, Muᶜāwiya wrote, "Bad things reached me from you; if you pay homage to Yazīd you will be thanked for that, otherwise you will be forced."[42]

Muᶜāwiya wrote to al-Ḥusayn stating that, "many unexpected things reached me about you," but he was reluctant to name them. He asked al-Ḥusayn to keep his *bayᶜa* to him and warned al-Ḥusayn not to cut off his relationship with him by refusing to acknowledge Yazīd's succession.[43]

---

[41] Ibid., 1:178.
[42] Ibid. 1:179.
[43] Ibid.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Finally, Muᶜāwiya sent a poem to Ibn al-Zubayr, warning him of a bad fate if he continued his opposition to Yazīd's caliphate.[44]

Muᶜāwiya's intention was to threaten the prominent nobles of Medina and to force them to accept Yazīd's succession, so that if they did so, the people of Medina would follow them and pay homage to Yazīd. Did Muᶜāwiya succeed in his endeavor? All these prominent persons responded to Muᶜāwiya individually, defending themselves and expressing their refusal to accept his decision. The first one who answered Muᶜāwiya was Ibn ᶜAbbās, who denied that he had participated in ᶜUthman's killing, contending that he was more angry about his assassination than anyone else, whereas "you were absent from that event."[45]

Ibn Jaᶜfar wrote to Muᶜāwiya: "As for your saying that you will force me to acknowledge Yazīd's succession, indeed, we forced you and your father to accept Islam until both of you entered it reluctantly."[46] In his turn, Ibn al-Zubayr sent a poem to Muᶜāwiya, describing him as an unjust man and telling him that he was too strong to be afraid of his threats.[47]

Al-Ḥusayn's letter to Muᶜāwiya deserves special attention. Ibn Saᶜd and al-Dīnawarī narrate that after al-Ḥasan's death in 50/670, a group of a prominent Kūfan leaders visited al-Ḥusayn in Medina. Marwān Ibn al-Ḥakam, the governor of Medina at the time, informed Muᶜāwiya about the danger of these meetings. Upon hearing this, Muᶜāwiya wrote to al-Ḥusayn, threatening him and reminding him to hold his *bayᶜa*. Then al-Ḥusayn wrote his letter to Muᶜāwiya. However, both Ibn Saᶜd and al-Dīnawarī

[44] Ibid.
[45] Ibid., 1: 179-180.
[46] Ibid., 1: 180.
[47] Ibid.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

abbreviated al-Ḥusayn's letter and ignored many important points, which were narrated by other sources.[48]

Al-Balādhurī, on the other hand, narrates that some people from Iraq and the elite nobility from Ḥijāz used to visit al-Ḥusayn frequently in 51/671, asking him to be their leader. They did not suspect that the people would choose al-Ḥusayn as the new caliph after Muᶜāwiya's death. When ᶜAmr Ibn ᶜUthmān Ibn ᶜAffān noticed their frequent meetings with al-Ḥusayn, he warned Marwān about the danger of these meetings. Marwān then wrote to Muᶜāwiya informing him of the critical situation. Muᶜāwiya wrote to al-Ḥusayn, warning him against any rebellion or opposition. In his letter to Muᶜāwiya, al-Ḥusayn condemned Muᶜāwiya's action of adopting Ziyād as his bastard brother and killing Ḥujr.[49]

On the other hand, Ibn Qutayba reports that al-Ḥusayn sent his letter to Muᶜāwiya when the latter wanted to secure allegiance from the people of Medina for Yazīd and when Saᶜīd Ibn al-ᶜĀṣ was the governor of Medina. A full account of this letter, similar to al-Balādhurī's version with some additions, is recorded by Ibn Qutayba. In the beginning of his letter, al-Ḥusayn advises Muᶜāwiya not to listen to those hypocrites and liars who are seeking trouble. Al-Ḥusayn confirms that he is not willing to fight Muᶜāwiya or oppose him, although he has all the right to fight Muᶜāwiya and his party: "the unjust party and the supporters of the *shayṭān*." He reminds Muᶜāwiya of his criminal conduct and his deviation from Islamic codes, writing:

> Are you not the one who killed Ḥujr and his pious companions, those who order good (*maᶜrūf*) and forbid evil (*munkar*)? You killed them after you

[48] Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal al-Ḥusayn*, pp. 53-4. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 224. In his account, Ibn Saᶜd reports that the Kūfans asked al-Ḥusayn to break his *bayᶜa* to Muᶜāwiya, but he refused.
[49] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 128-30. Al-Ḥusayn's letter, according to al-Balādhurī's account, was mentioned earlier.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> gave them a guarantee that they would not be followed and executed. You did this only because you did not respect God's covenant. Are you not the one who killed ᶜAmr Ibn al-Ḥamiq al-Khuzāᶜī after you granted him a safe-conduct? Are you not the one who adopted Ziyād, who was born on ᶜUbayd's bed, as your bastard brother? You claimed that Ziyād was the son of your father, Abū Sufyān, and deviated from the Sunna of the Prophet, which stipulated that the child should belong to his father's bed. Are you not the killer of al-Ḥaḍramī, because he followed the religion of ᶜAlī, which is the same religion as his cousin Muḥammad's? And because of this religion, you acquired your position... Be aware of the fact that Allāh would not forget your killing of the innocents and your nomination of a child [Yazīd], who drinks wine and plays with dogs..."[50]

When the letters of al-Ḥusayn, Ibn ᶜAbbas, Ibn Jaᶜfar and Ibn al-Zubayr reached Muᶜāwiya, he instructed his governor in Medina, Saᶜīd, to ask all the people of Medina to pay homage to Yazīd, excluding none of the Muhājirūn (emigrants), the Anṣār (helpers) or their descendants. Despite his rudeness, Saᶜīd failed for the second time to force the Medinans to pay homage to Yazīd and wrote to Muᶜāwiya, informing him that they followed the decision of the prominent nobles in refusing to recognize Yazīd.[51] After his failure to impose Yazīd's *bayᶜa* on the people of Medina, Muᶜāwiya realized that Yazīd's succession could not be completed without the acknowledgement of the nobles of Medina and that this would not happen unless he came to Medina himself. Khalīfa tells us that Muᶜāwiya brought with him one thousand soldiers from Damascus[52] and Ibn Qutayba states that Muᶜāwiya reached Medina accompanied by a great number of the Syrian people.[53] This indicates that Muᶜāwiya intended to threaten the people of Medina and the four nobles and even to force them to pay homage to Yazīd by bringing such numerous troops from Damascus.

---

[50] Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 180-1.
[51] Ibid., 1: 182.
[52] Khalīfa, *Ta'rīkh*, p. 160.
[53] Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 183.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

According to Ibn A^{c}tham, as soon as Mu^{c}āwiya reached Medina, the four persons came to meet him in the outskirts, but he confronted them with a very harsh manner and threatened them with severe punishment if they insisted on their refusal to swear allegiance to Yazīd.[54]

Mu^{c}āwiya in 56/676 entered the mosque and delivered a sermon, emphasizing his decision to nominate Yazīd as his successor, and confirming that he did not see any deficiency in Yazīd and that nobody was more qualified than he for the caliphate.[55] When ^{c}Ā'isha, one of the prominent wives of the Prophet and a very influential person in Medina, heard that Mu^{c}āwiya intended to impose Yazīd's succession on the people of Medina and had threatened the sons of the Ṣaḥāba into acknowledging him, she came to him and said, "Was it not enough for you that you killed my brother Muḥammad and burned his body?"[56] She also condemned Mu^{c}āwiya for threatening the sons of the Prophet's Companions and forcing them to pay homage to Yazīd, stating that, "Now you come to Medina to do harm to the sons of the Ṣaḥāba of the Prophet, whereas you are from those who were set free (*ṭulaqā'*) by the Prophet and had no right to the caliphate." Finally, she threatened him with death in revenge for her brother. ^{c}Ā'isha continued, "I have been told that you are threatening my brother ^{c}Abd al-Raḥmān, Ibn ^{c}Umar, my nephew, Ibn al-Zubayr and al-Ḥusayn the son of Fāṭima, the daughter of the Prophet. You have no right to do so."[57] According to Ibn A^{c}tham, Mu^{c}āwiya tried to apologize to her,

---

[54] Ibn A^{c}tham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 339-40. In his account, Khalīfa mentions only Ibn al-Zubayr, Ibn ^{c}Umar and Ibn Abī Bakr. Khalīfa, *Ta'rīkh*, p. 160.
[55] Ibid. Ibn A^{c}tham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 341.
[56] Mu^{c}āwiya killed Muḥammad Ibn Abī Bakr and burned his body when the latter was ^{c}Alī's governor of Egypt. See, for instance, al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 1: 230.
[57] Ibn A^{c}tham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 341. Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 183.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

explaining that all Muslims had paid homage to Yazīd and, therefore, he could not revoke this completed *bayᶜa*, but ᶜĀ'isha denied his claim.[58]

In her condemnation of Muᶜāwiya, ᶜĀ'isha focused on three points: that he had no right to the caliphate, that he had killed innocents, which entailed punishment and revenge, and that he intended to force the sons of the Prophet's Companions, who were more entitled to the caliphate than he, to acknowledge the succession of Yazīd, who had no right to it.

Ibn Qutayba and al-Ṭabarī relate that Muᶜāwiya tried to win over the five sons of the Ṣaḥāba: Ibn ᶜAbbās, Ibn ᶜUmar, Ibn al-Zubayr, Ibn Abī Bakr and al-Ḥusayn by deceiving them. He met each one of them individually beginning with al-Ḥusayn and confirmed to them that all the people of Medina had pledged allegiance to Yazīd except the noble persons. Each of them, except Ibn Abī Bakr, confirmed to Muᶜāwiya his readiness to pay homage to Yazīd if the rest of the nobles did so.[59] This account contradicts all other accounts, even those of Ibn Qutayba and al-Ṭabarī, as we will see, that al-Ḥusayn and Ibn al-Zubayr refused to acknowledge Yazīd until the end of their lives. Besides, although Ibn Qutayba and al-Ṭabarī mention five nobles, only four of them met with Muᶜāwiya; Ibn ᶜAbbās was ignored.

In fact, Ibn Qutayba contradicts himself, for he relates that on the next day, Muᶜāwiya summoned Ibn ᶜAbbās and al-Ḥusayn. When he described Yazīd's merits and his entitlement to the caliphate, al-Ḥusayn rejected Muᶜāwiya's statement and Yazīd's entitlement to the caliphate. Al-Ḥusayn started to argue that Yazīd was violating Islamic practices and he condemned Muᶜāwiya for deceiving the people by nominating Yazīd as

---

[58] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 341.
[59] Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 183-84. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4:225-6.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

his successor. Al-Ḥusayn also condemned Muᶜāwiya for his endeavor to keep him (al-Ḥusayn) from his right to the caliphate.[60]

Ibn Aᶜtham, on the other hand, narrates that Muᶜāwiya, while he was in Medina, decided to meet with the four nobles individually, in order to listen to their objections and to persuade them to acknowledge Yazīd's succession. He then sent for Ibn Abī Bakr, Ibn al-Zubayr and Ibn ᶜUmar, but he was told that they had all left for Mecca.[61] They perhaps left Medina because they were afraid that Muᶜāwiya might take severe action against them in case they showed any protest, especially when we remember that Muᶜāwiya had come to Medina with a huge group of Syrian troops.

According to Ibn Aᶜtham, Muᶜāwiya, while he was in Medina, did not send for al-Ḥusayn, but rather complained to Ibn ᶜAbbās about al-Ḥusayn's objection to Yazīd's nomination. Realizing that Muᶜāwiya might force al-Ḥusayn to submit to his decision, Ibn ᶜAbbās advised Muᶜāwiya to avoid doing any harm to al-Ḥusayn, otherwise he "would be harmed by all the people of the earth."[62] Having failed to secure Yazīd's succession from the prominent nobles in Medina by threats, Muᶜāwiya in 56/676 decided to set off to Mecca with his troops.

Muᶜāwiya's main task was to persuade the four nobles, especially al-Ḥusayn, to acknowledge Yazīd's nomination by utilizing different devices. Ibn Aᶜtham tells us that when Muᶜāwiya reached Mecca, its people came forward to meet him, including the four nobles. At Mecca, Muᶜāwiya changed his attitude towards them and tried to win them

[60] Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 184-5.
[61] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 342.
[62] Ibid.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

over by treating them kindly and granting them some gifts; nevertheless, al-Ḥusayn refused to receive Muᶜāwiya's gift.[63]

For a short period of time, Muᶜāwiya did not mention Yazīd's succession, but then decided to accomplish his task by meeting each of the four nobles individually, trying to treat them leniently and thus persuade them. This time, Muᶜāwiya first sent for al-Ḥusayn, informing him that all the provinces had paid homage to Yazīd and telling him that he had left the people of Medina to the last, because they were Yazīd's root and tribe, and they would not object to his succession. Mentioning al-Ḥusayn and the other prominent nobles who had objected to Yazīd's succession, Muᶜāwiya said that some people, who were not better than Yazīd, had refused to acknowledge his succession, and explained his decision in choosing Yazīd as his successor by stating, "If I knew that there was somebody better than Yazīd for the benefit of the Community of the Prophet I would not nominate Yazīd."[64]

Al-Ḥusayn objected to Muᶜāwiya's viewpoint, emphasizing that there were many nobles, whom Muᶜāwiya ignored, who were of better descent and breed than Yazīd. Muᶜāwiya admitted that al-Ḥusayn's mother was better than Yazīd's mother and that al-Ḥusayn's father had merits in Islam and a closer relationship to the Prophet than anybody else, but he denied that al-Ḥusayn was more qualified than Yazīd. Mentioning Yazīd's unsuitability for the caliphate and his corruption, al-Ḥusayn replied, "How can Yazīd, who drinks wine and commits debauchery, be in the best interest of the Muslim community?"[65] According to Ibn Aᶜtham, Muᶜāwiya ended his discussion with al-Ḥusayn by resorting to another device. As mentioned earlier, Muᶜāwiya did not come alone from

[63] Ibid., 2: 342-3.
[64] Ibid., 2: 343-4. Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 188-9.
[65] Ibid. According to Ibn Qutayba, this discussion took place in Medina. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 343-4.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Damascus; he brought with him an army of one thousand soldiers in order to consolidate his power and threaten those who objected to his decisions. Therefore, he threatened al-Ḥusayn with death at the hands of these soldiers who were "your enemy and your father's enemy," in case al-Ḥusayn refused to acknowledge Yazīd.[66]

Ibn Qutayba, on the other hand, narrates that Muᶜāwiya defended his decision in nominating Yazīd by stating that, before his death, the Prophet did not nominate a successor and that the Muslims paid homage to Abū Bakr; the latter acted according to the Book of God and the Sunna of the Prophet. Before his death, Abū Bakr nominated ᶜUmar as his successor and he followed the Book of God and the Sunna of the Prophet. Before ᶜUmar's death, the caliphate was subjected to a *shūrā* among six nominated Companions, according to ᶜUmar's instructions. Muᶜāwiya argued that Abū Bakr did not follow the Prophet's conduct and ᶜUmar did not follow in the footsteps of Abū Bakr; they followed their own discretion only, for the benefit of the community. Muᶜāwiya, therefore, concluded that despite people's disapproval of Yazīd's succession, he would follow his own discretion and nominate Yazīd only for the sake of the community.[67]

Expressing these opinions about the caliphate, Muᶜāwiya perhaps was trying to draw a new picture of Yazīd's conduct and affirm to the people that Yazīd would rule himself according to the Book of God and the Sunna of the Prophet, and that his caliphate required only their acknowledgment to be legitimate. But the question is: Did Muᶜāwiya succeed in persuading the sons of the Ṣaḥāba to draw new picture of Yazīd's conduct?

When he was presented to Muᶜāwiya, Ibn Abī Bakr confirmed that the matter of the caliphate could not be left to Muᶜāwiya's own desire to nominate his successor, but rather

---

[66] Ibid.
[67] Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 189.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

should be decided by *shūrā*. Ibn Abī Bakr told Muᶜāwiya that he would not pay homage to Yazīd, "the one who drinks wine and plays with monkeys."[68] According to Khalīfa and Ibn Qutayba, Muᶜāwiya warned Ibn Abī Bakr against being killed by the Syrian troops.[69]Al-Ṭabarī also tells us that when Muᶜāwiya sent after Ibn Abī Bakr, he reproached him for disobeying his decision. When Ibn Abī Bakr insisted in his refusal to acknowledge Yazīd's succession, Muᶜāwiya informed him that he intended to kill him for his objection to his decision.[70]

When Ibn ᶜUmar was presented to Muᶜāwiya, he warned him against disobedience, informing him that the people had paid their allegiance to Yazīd "except your group (*raḥṭ*)." Ibn ᶜUmar's disagreement with Muᶜāwiya was based on the Rightly Guided Caliphs' conduct and he argued that they also had sons, to whom Yazīd was not superior, but they had not nominated any of them. Being a peaceful man who preferred not to go against the community's unity, Ibn ᶜUmar, nevertheless, asserted to Muᶜāwiya that he would not stand against Yazīd's succession if all the people paid homage to him.[71]

According to al-Yaᶜqūbī, Ibn ᶜUmar refused Muᶜāwiya's request to acknowledge Yazīd's succession, protesting that he could not pay homage to a person whose conduct violated Islamic norms.[72] In fact, Ibn ᶜUmar was one of the four nobles who refused to acknowledge Yazīd's succession, but probably under Muᶜāwiya's threat, he changed his attitude and was ready to give in. This is emphasized by Khalīfa's account where, in one

---

[68] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 344.
[69] Khalīfa, *Ta'rīkh*, p. 161. Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 188.
[70] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 226.
[71] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 344. Khalīfa, *Tarīkh*, p. 161. Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 187-8.
[72] Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 228.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of his speeches at Medina, Mu^{c}āwiya mentions that he would kill Ibn ^{c}Umar if he refused to pay homage.[73]

Reiterating that all Muslims had pledged allegiance to Yazīd, Mu^{c}āwiya warned Ibn al-Zubayr against instigating a rebellion. Ibn al-Zubayr denied that he was rebellious, warning Mu^{c}āwiya against establishing a new foundation for the caliphate among Muslims. He advised Mu^{c}āwiya to follow in the footsteps of the earlier pious men (*al-Salaf al-Ṣāliḥ*), who had left the caliphate to be decided by *shūrā* among Muslims. Furthermore, Ibn al-Zubayr asked Mu^{c}āwiya to be God-fearing and to remember that he would be asked about his deeds on the Day of Judgment.[74] According to Ibn Qutayba, Mu^{c}āwiya threatened Ibn al-Zubayr with death if he persisted in his refusal to recognize Yazīd's succession.[75]

From these accounts, it is obvious that Mu^{c}āwiya tried to win over the four nobles but failed. He warned each of them that they would be killed at the hands of the Syrian troops if they persisted in opposing Yazīd's nomination. Except for Ibn ^{c}Umar who, under Mu^{c}āwiya's threat, expressed his readiness to pay homage to Yazīd if all the people swore allegiance to him; the other three sons of the Ṣaḥāba persisted in their belief that Yazīd was not qualified to be caliph, that Mu^{c}āwiya had no right to nominate his son for this office and that it should left to be decided by consultation.

Many questions present themselves at this juncture: Did Mu^{c}āwiya really try to force the sons of the Ṣaḥāba to acknowledge Yazīd's succession, even by threatening them with being killed by the Syrian troops? Did he really intend to kill them if they persisted in their refusal to recognize Yazīd? Or do these reports represent anti-Umayyad sentiment

---

[73] Khalīfa, *Ta'rīkh*, p.161.
[74] Ibn A^{c}tham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 343-4. Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 188-9.
[75] Ibid., 1: 188.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

intending to depict Muᶜāwiya as an unjust man who treated the sons of the Prophet's Companions brutally? In response to these questions, two things deserve to be taken into consideration: 1) some of theses accounts are narrated by Khalīfa Ibn Khayyāṭ who habitually reflects a pro-Umayyad viewpoint; 2) we have seen previously that, according to many sources, Saᶜd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ, al-Ḥasan, Mālik al-Ashtar and ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn Khālid Ibn al-Walīd had been killed at the instigation of Muᶜāwiya; all of them were killed by poisoned honey. Perhaps Muᶜāwiya was not serious in threatening them with death but rather wanted to force them to accept Yazīd's accession. This is true in the case of al-Ḥusayn, as we will see latter, but in the case of Ibn al-Zubayr, Muᶜāwiya, according to his will to Yazīd, was serious about getting rid of him.

It is also obvious that Muᶜāwiya failed to convince the sons of the Ṣaḥāba to accept Yazīd's entitlement to the caliphate or that he would act according to the Book of God, the Sunna of the Prophet and the conduct of the Rightly Guided Caliphs. Therefore, Muᶜāwiya tried to force them to pay homage to Yazīd, even by threatening them, in which their *bayᶜa* to Yazīd would be binding on them.

Muᶜāwiya, however, realized that he had failed to convince the nobles of the Quraysh to acknowledge Yazīd as his successor. This also meant that Muᶜāwiya would not be able to win over the people of Mecca and Medina and that Yazīd's succession would not be completed. Therefore, he thought of utilizing some other ways to accomplish his task. He tried to force the Banū Hāshim to comply with his desire. Since al-Ḥusayn was the head of the Banū Hāshim, Muᶜāwiya tried to secure his acknowledgement of Yazīd's succession by resorting to his tribe. Ibn ᶜAtham and Ibn Qutayba tell us that while residing in Mecca, Muᶜāwiya excluded the Banū Hāshim from receiving his gifts, which

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

were to be bestowed on the people of Quraysh. When Ibn ᶜAbbās asked him about the reason for this exclusion, Muᶜāwiya replied that it was only because al-Ḥusayn had refused to pay homage to Yazīd. Ibn ᶜAbbās was not satisfied with Muᶜāwiya's answer, arguing that some other prominent nobles had also refused to acknowledge Yazīd but were not excluded. When he did not receive an answer from Muᶜāwiya, Ibn ᶜAbbās warned him that he would incite the people to rise against him if Muᶜāwiya insisted on depriving the Banū Hāshim of his gifts. Realizing the importance of Ibn ᶜAbbās's position in both Mecca and Medina, Muᶜāwiya sent some gifts to the Banū Hāshim; al-Ḥusayn, however, refused to accept any of them.[76]

When Muᶜāwiya wanted to leave Mecca, he resorted to another device to convince the four nobles to acknowledge Yazīd's succession. According to Ibn Aᶜtham and Khalīfa, Muᶜāwiya asked them to be summoned in his presence and suggested there be a committee of consultation behind Yazīd's caliphate. Muᶜāwiya explained to them that he was not demanding much from them and expressed his desire that they would acknowledge Yazīd as caliph in name only; in fact, they would have the real power of the caliphate.[77]

However, Muᶜāwiya's maneuver did not work with these elites. They expressed their refusal to comply with Muᶜwiya's suggestion. Perhaps they realized that Muᶜāwiya was not serious and that, therefore, he would not fulfill his promise; his intention was to do away with their objections to Yazīd's succession. They also realized that Muᶜāwiya intended to deviate from the conduct of the Prophet and the Rightly-Guided example and transfer the caliphate to kinship. Therefore, Ibn al-Zubayr insisted that Muᶜāwiya should

[76] Ibid., p. 191. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 343.
[77] Ibid., 2: 346. Khalīfa, *Ta'rīkh*, pp. 163-4. 163.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

follow the example of the Prophet, who left the issue of the caliphate to be decided by the Community, or the example of Abū Bakr, who nominated ᶜUmar, other than his son, or the example of ᶜUmar, who left the caliphate to be decided by *shūrā*, ignoring his son and his family. When Muᶜāwiya asked the opinions of the other three nobles, they all agreed with Ibn al-Zubayr.[78]

Muᶜāwiya's maneuvers to convince the sons of Ṣaḥāba to accept his decision failed once more, and, therefore, he decided to resort to one last device; namely, the sword and deception. This time 56/676, Muᶜāwiya decided to force the four nobles to accept his decision publicly. Before leaving Mecca, he intended to deliver a final speech on the pulpit. He summoned the four nobles and warned them not to disavow his statement; otherwise, their fate would be in the hands of the Syrian troops. Muᶜāwiya is said to have assigned to each of the four nobles two armed Syrian soldiers, ordering his soldiers to behead whoever objected to his decision.

When the people were assembled in the mosque, Muᶜāwiya declared, "These four people, mentioning to the four sons of the Ṣaḥāba, are the masters of the Muslims and they have accepted Yazīd's nomination." In order to silence anyone who might oppose Muᶜāwiya's speech and to threaten the people (including the four persons), a group of Syrian soldiers then stood up and asked Muᶜāwiya to allow them to behead the four nobles, but Muᶜāwiya refused. Muᶜāwiya's maneuver worked this time and the people, thinking that the four nobles had agreed to swear allegiance to Yazīd, started to pay homage to him.[79] In order to silence any sound of objection that might arise from the four nobles, Muᶜāwiya probably instructed his soldiers to threaten them and to acquire

[78] Ibid. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 346.
[79] Ibid,. 2: 351-2. Khalīfa, *Ta'rīkh*, p. 164. Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 190.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

permission from him to behead them. It is clear that Mu^{c}āwiya brought such a great army with him from Damascus only to facilitate his task in nominating Yazīd.

The four persons, however, declared to the people that they disagreed with Mu^{c}āwiya's decision to nominate Yazīd. When the people asked them about the reason why they did not object to Mu^{c}āwiya's statement, the four nobles, according to Ibn A^{c}tham, explained that the red death (*al-mawt al-aḥmar*) was in front of their eyes; namely, in the swords of the Syrian soldiers.[80] When the people of Mecca blamed al-Ḥusayn for paying homage to Yazīd after he had refused to acknowledge his accession, he denied this, swearing by God that he had not recognized Yazīd.[81]

Khalīfa also tells us that it was circulated among the people that Ibn ^{c}Umar, Ibn al-Zubayr and Ibn Abī Bakr had paid homage to Yazīd, but the latter denied that.[82] According to Khalīfa's account then, not only al-Ḥusayn refused to recognize Yazīd's succession, but also Ibn Abī Bakr. Khalīfa states that it was only a rumor circulated among the people that some nobles had accepted Yazīd's succession.

Ibn Qutayba narrates that, before leaving Mecca, Mu^{c}āwiya distributed a lot of money among the people.[83] In doing this, Mu^{c}āwiya wanted to buy their silence and suppress any opposition to his decision. He utilized the same device with Sa^{c}īd Ibn ^{c}Uthmān Ibn ^{c}Affān who, being the son of the third Caliph, believed that he was more qualified for the caliphate than Yazīd. He is said to have disputed with Mu^{c}āwiya about the reason why he, Sa^{c}īd, had not been nominated as his successor instead of Yazīd. Sa^{c}īd argued that his parents were better than Yazīd's and that he was superior to Yazīd.

---

[80] Ibn A^{c}tham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 352.
[81] Ibid.
[82] Khalīfa, *Ta'rīkh*, p. 161.
[83] Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 191.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Mu^{c}āwiya admitted that Sa^{c}īd's father was better than Yazīd's but refused to admit that he was better than Yazīd. However, Mu^{c}āwiya won him over and bought his silence by nominating him as governor of Khurāsān.[84]

Did Mu^{c}āwiya succeed in persuading the people of Mecca and Medina and the four nobles to pay homage to Yazīd? Was Yazīd's succession assured when Mu^{c}āwiya announced that the four nobles of Quraysh had paid homage to Yazīd? Was al-Ḥusayn satisfied with this *bay^{c}a*? As mentioned earlier, al-Ḥusayn, according to many sources, continued to protest against Yazīd's nomination and against Mu^{c}āwiya's severe measures against the followers of ^{c}Alī. Some people of Ḥijāz and Kūfa, who believed in his entitlement to the caliphate, continued to visit al-Ḥusayn, urging him to rise against Mu^{c}āwiya, but he refused.

Despite the fact that Mu^{c}āwiya utilized many ploys to force the people of Mecca and Medina, especially the four prominent nobles, to acknowledge Yazīd's succession, he actually failed. Even when he tried to deceive the people by falsely claiming that the four nobles had paid homage to Yazīd, he did not succeed. Mu^{c}āwiya may have believed that he had succeeded in his mission and that the acknowledgment of Yazīd had been completed, but he was wrong. If it had been so, Yazīd, upon becoming caliph, would not have had to demand that the four nobles pledge allegiance to him and then take the same measures as his father in order to consolidate his caliphate, as we will see in the next part of this chapter.

In spite of Mu^{c}āwiya's threats, Ibn Abī Bakr insisted on his refusal to recognize Yazīd's accession to the caliphate up to his death.[85] As we will see, al-Ḥusayn and Ibn al-

[84] Ibid., 1: 191-2. Ibn A^{c}tham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 309-10. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 226-7.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Zubayr refused to pay homage to Yazīd until the last moments of their lives. Ibn ᶜUmar was the only one of the four nobles who was ready to acknowledge Yazīd's succession, although he expressed his opinion that Yazīd was not qualified for the caliphate, and, as mentioned previously, he did so only when he was threatened by Muᶜāwiya.

[85] Ibn Qutayba tells us that Ibn Abī Bakr died under blurred circumstances soon after Muᶜāwiy's departure from Medina. Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 191. The question that presents itself here is: What was the reason behind Ibn Abī Bakr's death and did Muᶜāwiya play any role in it?

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Part Two: Yazīd's Demand for Allegiance

We have seen, in part one of this chapter, that Muᶜāwiya utilized various devices in order to secure Yazīd's succession. The most important persons for him were the sons of the prominent Companions of the Prophet, who persisted that Yazīd was not entitled to the caliphate. Muᶜāwiya failed to persuade them to acknowledge Yazīd's succession, even by force. They refused to submit to Muᶜāwiy's desire because of Yazīd's violating of Islamic codes and his lack of qualifications for the caliphate. In fact, Muᶜāwiya, as mentioned earlier, did not fulfill his promises when he nominated his son for the caliphate because after Muᶜāwiya's death, according to the truce between Muᶜāwiya and al-Ḥasan, the caliphate should have reverted to al-Ḥasan or to have been decided by *shūrā*. Surprisingly enough, Muᶜāwiya asked al-Ḥusayn, who had honored his brother's agreement by not breaking his *bayᶜa* to Muᶜāwiya and by not complying with the Kūfans' call to rise against Muᶜāwiya, to keep his promises, although Muᶜāwiya himself had broken his.

Muᶜāwiya was fully aware of the outstanding position of al-Ḥusayn among the people of Ḥijāz and Kūfa, and, having failed to secure his acknowledgment of Yazīd's succession, Muᶜāwiya warned his son of this danger. Since the Kūfans had called al-Ḥusayn to rise against Muᶜāwiya and since al-Ḥusayn refused to acknowledge Yazīd's succession, Muᶜāwiya had no doubt that, after his death, the Kūfans would call al-Ḥusayn to rise against Yazīd. Not only al-Ḥusayn, but also Ibn Zubayr and Ibn Abī Bakr had refused to recognize Yazīd. Therefore, Muᶜāwiya, before his death, wrote his will to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Yazīd, warning him of the danger from those nobles and the consequences of their protest:

> O my son, I have spared you the effort, made things smooth for you, subdued your enemies for you, subjected the necks of the Arabs for you, and created unity for you. I am only afraid that four individuals of Quraysh might challenge you for this matter [the caliphate] which was established for you-- al-Ḥusayn Ibn ᶜAlī, ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn ᶜUmar, ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn al-Zubayr, and ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn Abī Bakr. As far as ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn ᶜUmar is concerned, he is a man whom righteousness has overwhelmed, and if no one else were left, he would acknowledge you. As far as al-Ḥusayn is concerned, the people of Iraq will not leave him alone until they make him rebel. If he rebels against you, and you should defeat him, then pardon him, because he has close kinship and a great claim. As far as Ibn Abī Bakr is concerned, he is a man, who, if he should see his companions doing something, he would do likewise. He is only interested in women and pleasure. As for the one who crouches for you as a crouching lion and tricks you as a sly fox, and if an opportunity enables [him] he would spring, that is ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn al-Zubayr. If he does that to you, and you are able to overpower him, then tear him limb from limb.[86]

Muᶜāwiya's will deserves attention. It is clear from it that his efforts to secure the approval of the four prominent nobles had not been successful, even though he had forced them to keep silent and had announced to the people that they had paid homage to Yazīd. Muᶜāwiya was still anxious that they would persist in refusing Yazīd's caliphate. Ibn ᶜUmar and Ibn Abī Bakr in Muᶜāwiya's viewpoint posed no danger to Yazīd; the former was a man of peace, and had no aspiration to the caliphate, and the latter had occupied himself with women and enjoyment. In fact, Ibn ᶜUmar had expressed to Muᶜāwiya his readiness to swear allegiance to Yazīd if all the people were to acknowledge his caliphate.

Realizing that Ibn al-Zubayr aspired to the caliphate, Muᶜāwiya predicted that he would not give up resisting Yazīd and would attack him whenever he had a chance to do

---

[86] Al-Ṭabarī, The Caliphate of Muᶜāwiya. *The History of al-Ṭabarī* (*Ta'rīkh al-Rusul wal-Mulūk*). XVIII, Translated and annotated by Michael G. Morony, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1987, p. 209. The content of Muᶜāwiya's will is also narrated by al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 226. A similar account to al-Ṭabarī's is recorded by Ibn Aᶜtham with some additions. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 2: 351-2.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

so. Mu^{c}āwiya believed that Ibn al-Zubayr was very dangerous for Yazīd and that the only way to deal with his protest was to give him no chance and attack him brutally in order to get rid of the danger. It is very understandable that Mu^{c}āwiya was ready to assassinate anyone who objected to his desires and stood against Yazīd's caliphate, as he had done with al-Ḥasan and Sa^{c}d Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ. Mu^{c}āwiya perhaps believed that Ibn al-Zubayr's killing constituted no harm to Yazīd's caliphate and, therefore, did not take Ibn al-Zubayr's kinship into consideration.

The real danger for Yazīd was al-Ḥusayn because of his outstanding place among the people and his relationship to the Prophet. Mu^{c}āwiya had also received the news that, after al-Ḥasan's death, the Kūfans expressed their readiness to pay homage to al-Ḥusayn and had called him to rise against Mu^{c}āwiya, but that al-Ḥusayn had asked them to wait until Mu^{c}āwiya's death. Based on all these considerations Mu^{c}āwiya had no doubt that, after his death, the Kūfans would reject Yazīd's caliphate, call al-Ḥusayn to rise against Yazīd and swear allegiance to him as their caliph.

The question here is: Was Mu^{c}āwiya's reason, when he advised Yazīd not to do harm to al-Ḥusayn, because of al-Ḥusayn's relationship to the Prophet? If Mu^{c}āwiya's intention was to protect al-Ḥusayn's dignity, the questions here are: Why did Mu^{c}āwiya poison al-Ḥasan, who had the same relationship to the Prophet as his brother al-Ḥusayn? Why did Mu^{c}āwiya not consider Ibn al-Zubayr's relationship to the Prophet, even though it was not close like al-Ḥusayn's? Perhaps Mu^{c}āwiya realized that the killing of al-Ḥusayn would entail a very severe consequence for Yazīd's caliphate and would put Yazīd in a serious situation. Therefore, in order to protect Yazīd from this risk, Mu^{c}āwiya advised him to deal with al-Ḥusayn gently.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Did Yazīd follow his father's will and advice, especially with regard to al-Ḥusayn? Did he intend to deal with al-Ḥusayn kindly, even if he refused to acknowledge his caliphate? In fact, Yazīd did not adhere to his father's will or listen to his advice, as we will see soon.

Ibn Aʿtham narrates that Yazīd was not in Damascus when he received the news of his father's death. When he arrived there, his intention was to prepare the Syrians for a confrontation with the Iraqi people, declaring, "We are the people of justice and the supporters of the religion." He also informed them that there would be a war between him and the Iraqi people, claiming that he saw in his dream a river of blood which he could not pass until ʿUbayd Allāh Ibn Ziyād, the governor of Baṣra, "came and passed it before me while I was looking at him." Hearing this statement the Syrians expressed their readiness and willingness to fight against whomever he wanted to fight.[87]

From his father's will, Yazīd had no doubt that the Kūfans would call al-Ḥusayn to rise against him. In order to prepare himself for a confrontation against the people of Iraq, Yazīd wanted to test the loyalty of the Syrians, the real supporters of his power, and their readiness to fight against the Iraqi people. For this reason, perhaps either Yazīd created the story about the dream or the historians did.

Ibn Aʿtham also reports that Yazīd wrote to his deputies in all the provinces, ordering them to take the oath of allegiance from the people. The Syrians not only swore allegiance to him, but also acknowledged his son, Muʿāwiya (d. 64/683), as his successor. Grateful for their allegiance, Yazīd bestowed money on them.[88] It is clear that

[87] Ibn Aʿtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 6. See also al-Yaʿqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 241.
[88] Ibn Aʿtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 7-8.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Mu^{c}āwiya's plan to transform the caliphate to be inherited within his family had worked out, at least in Damascus, the seat of the Umayyad authorities.

Even though the Syrians paid homage to Yazīd, his caliphate could not be consolidated and its legitimacy would not be secured unless the people of Mecca and Medina acknowledged him, especially, the prominent nobles in Medina. In fact, Yazīd's first concern after his accession to the caliphate was to take allegiance from the four nobles.[89] Moreover, he feared that the Iraqi people would refuse to acknowledge his caliphate and would rise against him as long as al-Ḥusayn disapproved of it. Yazīd was not unaware of the fact that al-Ḥusayn would refuse to comply with his call, as he already had in Mu^{c}āwiya's lifetime, and, therefore, spared no time in obtaining his approval. Therefore, Yazīd attempted to get al-Ḥusayn's concession by force and he did not follow his father's instructions to deal with al-Ḥusayn kindly.

How did Yazīd deal with the prominent nobles in Medina in order to secure their allegiance? In his very brief account and contrary to other accounts, Ibn Sa^{c}d maintains that Yazīd wrote to his new governor in Medina, al-Walīd Ibn ^{c}Utba Ibn Abī Sufyān (d. 75/694), instructing him to treat al-Ḥusayn and Ibn al-Zubayr kindly when taking the *bay^{c}a* from them.[90] Ibn Sa^{c}d perhaps wanted to eliminate any responsibility from Yazīd and put the blame on al-Walīd in case he committed any harm to al-Ḥusayn. Ibn Sa^{c}d narrates that al-Walīd insulted al-Ḥusayn and fought with him when he refused to pay homage to Yazīd.[91] In addition to the fact that Ibn Sa^{c}d's account is not supported by any other sources, it is unlikely that al-Walīd would oppose Yazīd's orders and not follow his instructions by dealing with al-Ḥusayn cruelly.

---

[89] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 250.
[90] Ibn Sa^{c}d, *Maqtal al-Ḥusayn*, p. 55.
[91] Ibid.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Al-Ṭabarī, al-Balādhurī and al-Dīnawarī narrate that Yazīd wrote to al-Walīd, informing him of Muᶜāwiya's death and a small parchment attachment instructed his governor to seize al-Ḥusayn, Ibn al-Zubayr and Ibn ᶜUmar, to deal with them brutally and to give them no respite until they paid homage to Yazīd.[92]

Ibn Aᶜtham concurs with the above-mentioned sources that Yazīd attached a small parchment to his letter to al-Walīd, but disagrees with its contents. He reports that Yazīd ordered al-Walīd to take allegiance from the four nobles and to behead whoever refused to submit.[93] However, it is unlikely that Yazīd would have ordered his governor to decapitate Ibn ᶜUmar and Ibn Abī Bakr, since they constituted no danger to Yazīd's caliphate, according to Muᶜāwiya's depiction. If Yazīd had ordered his governor to behead some of the nobles, he would have certainly specified al-Ḥusayn and Ibn al-Zubayr, the most dangerous opponents to his caliphate. This interpretation might be supported by al-Yaᶜqūbī's account that Yazīd ordered al-Walīd to seize and behead al-Ḥusayn and Ibn al-Zubayr at once if they refused to give the *bayᶜa* to him.[94]

The question that presents itself here is: Why did Yazīd send a small parchment to al-Walīd, instructing him about how to deal with al-Ḥusayn and Ibn al-Zubayr, rather than stating this in his original letter? Yazīd must have given a special instruction to al-Walīd in regard to taking homage from al-Ḥusayn and Ibn al-Zubayr. He perhaps did not want to expose the contents of the small parchment publicly but rather keep it a secret between him and his governor in order to bear no responsibility if al-Walīd followed his instructions and beheaded them. Yazīd, therefore, would easily be able to announce to the

---

[92] Al-Ṭabarī, on the authority of Abū Mikhnaf, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 250. Al-Balādhurī, on the authority of Abū Mikhaf, ᶜAwāna and others, *Ansāb*, 5:313. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 227.

[93] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3:9.

[94] Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 241. In his references to this report, Jafri wrongly mentions al-Balādhurī and al-Ṭabarī. In fact, neither of them narrates this account. See Jafri, *The Origins*, p. 176.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

public that he had ordered al-Walīd not to commit any harm to al-Ḥusayn and Ibn al-Zubayr, but that al-Walīd had not followed his instructions and, therefore, was the only one responsible for this crime.

The news of Muᶜāwiya's death and Yazīd's orders with respect to the four nobles weighed heavily on the new governor. He therefore sought help from the former governor of Medina, Marwān Ibn al-Ḥakam, in spite of the enmity between them.[95] Marwān advised him to call for al-Ḥusayn and Ibn al-Zubayr before they learned about Muᶜāwiya's death and execute them if they refused to pay homage to Yazīd. If they learn of Muᶜāwiya's death, Marwān explained, "Each of them will rise up from a different direction, proclaim opposition, and summon men to himself."[96]

Many points of this account deserve attention. First, it is obvious that al-Walīd was worried about the consequences of following Yazīd's commands; otherwise, he would not have had consulted anybody in fulfilling the orders of the caliph. Second, it is unlikely that Marwān, who had been dismissed from his office by the caliph and who needed to keep Yazīd contented, would oppose Yazīd's instructions by suggesting to al-Walīd that he behead al-Ḥusayn and Ibn al-Zubayr in case they persisted in their refusal to give their *bayᶜa* to Yazīd. Third, Ibn ᶜUmar and Ibn Abī Bakr, according to Muᶜāwiya's will, constituted no danger for Yazīd's caliphate and, therefore, should not have been included in Yazīd's attached letter. These considerations give more credibility to al-Yaᶜqūbī's account that Yazīd had ordered al-Walīd to behead al-Ḥusayn and Ibn al-Zubayr in case they refused to pay homage to him and that Marwān was just following his orders.

---

[95] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 250. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 313-4. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 9. In his account, Ibn Aᶜtham tells us that Marwān was deprived of his office by Yazīd's orders and was replaced by al-Walīd.

[96] Al-Ṭabarī, on the authority of Abū Mikhnaf, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 250-1. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 314. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 9-10. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 227. Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 241. Al-Ṭabarī and al-Balādhurī include Ibn ᶜUmar in their report. In his account, Ibn Aᶜtham includes Ibn Abī Bakr also.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

However, al-Walīd sent for al-Ḥusayn and Ibn al-Zubayr at an unusual time of the night to be summoned to the governor's palace. Unlike Ibn al-Zubayr, who wanted to escape from Medina, al-Ḥusayn decided to meet the governor. He predicted that he would be asked by the governor to pay homage to Yazīd, as he had told Ibn al-Zubayr when the latter had asked him about his intention. Al-Ḥusayn also realized that he might be seized by the governor's men if he declined to comply with his demand. Therefore, al-Ḥusayn, in order to protect himself from the governor's men in case of serious confrontation, decided to meet the governor accompanied by a strong band of his followers and his household. However, he ordered his followers to stay at the door, instructing them to come in only when they heard his voice rise.[97]

Informing him about the news of Muᶜāwiya's death, al-Walīd demanded al-Ḥusayn's immediate recognition of the new caliph. In order to avoid any confrontation with the governor, al-Ḥusayn did not expose his objection to Yazīd's caliphate, telling him that he would not pay homage to Yazīd in private: " When you summon the people to swear allegiance to Yazīd, then call me with them."[98] Al-Walīd tried to avoid any fight with al-Ḥusayn and was hesitant to confront him because he was acquainted with the dangerous consequences of this conflict. He wanted to deal with al-Ḥusayn peacefully and might have believed that al-Ḥusayn would pay homage to Yazīd in public. Therefore, al-Walīd was satisfied with al-Ḥusayn's suggestion and permitted him to go home without paying homage to Yazīd.[99]

---

[97] Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 227. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, p. 251. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 11. According to Ibn Aᶜtham, when he was asked by Ibn al-Zubayr about his intention, al-Ḥusayn declared that he would never pay homage to Yazīd, who violated Islamic norms publicly.

[98] Ibid. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, pp. 227-8. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 251. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 316-7.

[99] Ibid. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 251. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, pp. 227-8. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 13.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Did al-Ḥusayn really feel that a private *bayᶜa* was not satisfactory and, therefore, prepare to pay homage in public? It is not clear from al-Ḥusayn's dialogue with the governor that he was prepared to swear allegiance to Yazīd in public; rather, al-Ḥusayn pointed out that he would be summoned with the people, when the governor called them to be summoned. He perhaps intended to announce to the people, in public, that he refused to recognize Yazīd's caliphate, as he had done during Muᶜāwiya's time, thus proclaiming Yazīd's unsuitability for the caliphate and urging them to protest against him.

Al-Ḥusayn's intention not to recognize Yazīd's caliphate is further understood from Marwān's argument with al-Walīd. Marwān rebuked the governor's decision to permit al-Ḥusayn to go home without recognizing Yazīd, explaining that al-Ḥusayn would never pay homage to Yazīd if he left the governor's house. Marwān, who perhaps intended to demonstrate his loyalty and sincerity to Yazīd, advised al-Walīd to seize this opportunity to coerce al-Ḥusayn to submit to Yazīd's orders before leaving the palace. He stated that if al-Ḥusayn left without paying homage, "You will never have the same power over him except by much bloodshed between you and him." Moreover, Marwān asked the governor to imprison al-Ḥusayn and not permit him to leave until he had paid homage to Yazīd or had been beheaded. Hearing this, al-Ḥusayn reproached Marwān for his statement and left without paying homage to Yazīd.[100]

According to Ibn Aᶜtham, al-Ḥusayn not only censured Marwān for his proclamation, but also disclosed that he would never acknowledge Yazīd's caliphate. Al-Ḥusayn stated,

[100] Ibid., 3: 14. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 251-2. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 317. According to al-Balādhurī, the governor also reproached Marwān for his severe statements against al-Ḥusayn.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"We are the family of the Prophet, Yazīd is dissolute, a drunk, and a killer of the innocent; someone like me would never pledge allegiance to someone like him."[101]

However, al-Ḥusayn realized that his life was in danger if he persisted in his refusal to pay homage to Yazīd, and, therefore, decided to leave his residence in Medina, taking refuge in Mecca. Al-Ḥusayn's main reason for leaving Medina was his refusal to submit to recognizing Yazīd's caliphate; otherwise, he would be exposed to harassment. Al-Ḥusayn's dangerous situation in Medina is emphasized by Ibn Sa^{c}d. He reports that Yazīd complained to Ibn ^{c}Abbās about al-Ḥusayn's refusal to recognize his caliphate and about his correspondence with the Kūfans. Yazīd also requested Ibn ^{c}Abbās to dissuade al-Ḥusayn from being opposed to him. In response, Ibn ^{c}Abbās told Yazīd that al-Ḥusayn had taken refuge in Mecca only because of the harassment by Yazīd's agents. Ibn ^{c}Abbās, however, promised Yazīd to do his utmost to calm the situation.[102]

Ibn A^{c}tham's account provides further evidence for the fact that al-Ḥusayn refused to acknowledge Yazīd and that he could not stay in Medina because his life was in danger. Ibn A^{c}tham tells us that when Ibn ^{c}Umar was in Mecca, he confirmed to al-Ḥusayn that no harm would reach him if he went back to Medina and stayed at his house, even without paying homage to Yazīd. Al-Ḥusayn replied that the Umayyad officials would never leave him alone if he did not pay homage to Yazīd or be killed.[103]

Al-Ḥusayn's expectation that he would be killed if he refused to recognize Yazīd's caliphate is also supported by Ibn Muṭī^{c}'s statement. ^{c}Abd Allāh Ibn Muṭī^{c} al-^{c}Adawī (d. 73/692), a prominent noble in Medina and one of Ibn al-Zubayr's associates, was imprisoned in Medina by the governor's men because of Ibn al-Zubayr's refusal to

[101] Ibn A^{c}tham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 14.
[102] Ibn Sa^{c}d, *Maqtal al-Ḥusayn*, pp. 59-60.
[103] Ibn A^{c}tham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 28-9.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

comply with Yazīd's demand. He realized that al-Ḥusayn's life was in danger in Medina and, therefore, advised him to take refuge in Mecca. When he met with al-Ḥusayn, Ibn Muṭīᶜ expressed his fear that al-Ḥusayn would be killed at the hands of the Umayyad authorities if he refused to submit to Yazīd's claim and complied with the Kufans' call. Moreover, Ibn Muṭīᶜ predicted that al-Ḥusayn's killing would create disastrous consequences for the Muslim community, declaring to al-Ḥusayn that if the Umayyad officials were to kill him "we will become slaves after you."[104]

Al-Ḥusayn decided to leave Medina, but before doing that, he wanted to announce the reasons for his decision. Ibn Aᶜtham narrates that, before leaving Medina, al-Ḥusayn wrote to his half brother, Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya (d. 81/700), who had advised him to stay in Mecca as long as it was secure for him:[105]

> I have not left my residence out of joy, in gratitude, corruption, or injustice; rather, I have left to seek a reform (*iṣlāḥ*) in the community of my grandfather Muḥammad. I want to command morality (*maᶜrūf*) and to forbid wrong (*munkar*) and follow the conduct (*sīra*) of my grandfather, my father, and the rightly Guided Caliphs.[106]

According to this account, al-Ḥusayn declared that Yazīd's caliphate would lead to corruption in the Muslim community because of Yazīd's violation of Islamic norms. As the Prophet's grandson, al-Ḥusayn believed that he was committed to following in the footsteps of his grandfather and that he was more responsible than anybody else for preventing corruption. Al-Ḥusayn realized that his responsibility was to call for good and seek reform, not to support corruption through legitimizing Yazīd's caliphate Therefore, al-Ḥusayn declared that he could not stay in Medina to swear allegiance to Yazīd and

---

[104] Ibid., 3: 25. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 368. Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal al-Ḥusayn*, p. 56. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 261. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, 228-9.
[105] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 253. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 22-3.
[106] Ibid., 3: 23.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

decided to leave that city accompanied by most of his household and some of his followers.[107]

The governor, al-Walīd, most likely was delighted with al-Ḥusayn's decision to leave Medina because he wanted to avoid confrontation with al-Ḥusayn and, therefore, not be blamed if his blood was shed. However, al-Walīd also needed to prove his loyalty to the caliph. Therefore, he sent many messengers after al-Ḥusayn and Ibn al-Zubayr, summoning them to the governor's palace. It was reported that Ibn al-Zubayr refused to comply with the governor's call, and, therefore, the governor's messengers threatened to kill him. However, Ibn al-Zubayr sent his brother, Jaᶜfar, to ask the governor to stop harassing him and promising that he would bring Ibn al-Zubayr to the governor himself. Al-Walīd accepted Jaᶜfar's intercession and stopped irritating Ibn al-Zubayr. Ibn al-Zubayr seized this opportunity and left Medina with his brother under the cover of night. They avoided the main road for fear of pursuit and headed for Mecca. Following Marwān's advice, the governor sent horsemen in order to pursue Ibn al-Zubayr, but they were not able to find him.[108]

As far as Ibn ᶜUmar is concerned, al-Balādhurī and al-Ṭabarī tell us, on the authority of Abū Mikhanf, that al-Walīd, according to Yazīd's instruction, sent for Ibn ᶜUmar and asked him to swear allegiance to Yazīd. Ibn ᶜUmar expressed his readiness to submit to Yazīd's order on the condition that he would do so only after all people had paid their homage to him.[109] According to another account, al-Ṭabarī narrates, on the authority of

[107] Ibid., 3: 24. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 317. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 228. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 253.
[108] Ibid., 4: 252-3. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 15-6. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 228. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 314-5.
[109] Ibid., 5: 316. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 254.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

al-Wāqidī, that Ibn ᶜUmar and Ibn ᶜAbbās were in Mecca at the time of Muᶜāwiya's death and that they both swore allegiance to Yazīd.[110]

As for Ibn ᶜUmar, there is no reason to doubt that he paid homage to Yazīd since he had confirmed, on many occasions, as mentioned earlier, that he would recognize Yazīd's caliphate when all people had sworn allegiance to him. As for Ibn ᶜAbbās, it is unlikely that he paid homage to Yazīd since Ibn ᶜAbbās continued to condemn Yazīd's conduct and criticize his offenses against al-Ḥusayn and his family.[111] It is perhaps for this reason that al-Ṭabarī undermines al-Wāqidī's account by stating, "al-Wāqidī claimed" (*'zaᶜama al-Wāqidī'*).[112]

Ibn al-Zubayr, who reached Mecca before al-Ḥusayn, gathered people around him and urged them to stand against Yazīd. Although he had ambition to the caliphate, Ibn al-Zubayr was reported to have been concealing this ambition from the people.[113] As soon as al-Ḥusayn settled in Mecca, the people abandoned Ibn al-Zubayr and gathered around him. Ibn al-Zubayr had realized that the people would not follow him and embrace his aspiration so long as al-Ḥusayn remained in Mecca, because of his outstanding position among people. In their eyes, al-Ḥusayn was more respected and more capable of commanding the people's obedience than Ibn al-Zubayr.[114]

For this reason, Ibn al-Zubayr started to visit al-Ḥusayn and, unlike some other people who advised al-Ḥusayn to remain in Mecca, recommended that he go to Iraq. Ibn al-Zubayr further recommended that al-Ḥusayn answer his followers' call in Iraq, urging

---

[110] Ibid.
[111] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 321-22. Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 248-50.
[112] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 254.
[113] Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal al-Ḥusayn*, p. 56.
[114] Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 3: 55-6. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 229. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rikh*, 4: 261. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 368.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

him to fight the tyrannous people, the Umayyad authorities.[115] Ibn al-Zubayr was reluctant to see al-Ḥusayn residing in Mecca and his intention was to get rid of him in order to have full control over the Ḥijāz.

Ibn al-Zubayr was anxious about seeing al-Ḥusayn residing in Mecca. His discomfort is further indicated by the story that when al-Ḥusayn decided to leave Mecca, Ibn ᶜAbbās said to Ibn al-Zubayr that, after al-Ḥusayn's departure, he would achieve his goal and become master of the Ḥijāz.[116] However, Ibn al-Zubayr tried to demonstrate that he was not bothered by al-Ḥusayn's stay in Mecca and that he was even ready to pledge allegiance to al-Ḥusayn. According to Ibn Saᶜd and al-Balādhurī, Ibn al-Zubayr confirmed to al-Ḥusayn his entitlement to the caliphate and asserted that if al-Ḥusayn called the people to swear allegiance to himself, all the people of Ḥijāz would comply with his call, including Ibn al-Zubayr.[117]

It is obvious that Ibn al-Zubayr was aware of the fact that al-Ḥusayn was his only strong rival for the caliphate because of his leading position among the people of Ḥijāz and Kūfa. He also admitted that al-Ḥusayn was more entitled to the caliphate than Yazīd and, because of his kinship to the Prophet, was more entitled than anyone else to fight the Umayyad officials.

Hearing of Muᶜāwiya's death and of al-Ḥusayn's refusal to acknowledge Yazīd's caliphate, the Kūfans once again seized the opportunity and called on him to rise against the new caliph. They had no doubt that this time al-Ḥusayn would not disappoint them, since they had followed his advice and waited until Muᶜāwiya's death. As soon as they

[115] Ibid., 5: 325. Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 56.
[116] Ibid., p. 61. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 374.
[117] Ibid., 3: 375. Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 61.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

received the news that al-Ḥusayn had moved to Mecca, the Kūfans gathered in the house of Sulaymān Ibn Ṣurad al-Khuzāᶜī (d. 65/684), a Companion of the Prophet and one of the prominent followers of ᶜAlī, and held a series of meetings, discussing the new situation and expressing strong support for al-Ḥusayn.[118]

Knowing that the Kūfans had failed al-Ḥusayn's father and his brother in fighting against Muᶜāwiya, Sulaymān wanted to be sure of their loyalty and devotion to him before calling him and exposing him to any danger. He told them that they should write to al-Ḥusayn only if they knew that they would be his helpers and fighters against his enemies and that they should be ready to sacrifice themselves on his behalf. Otherwise, if they feared failure and weakness, they should not "lure the man to risk his own life." They all declared their readiness to fight against al-Ḥusayn's enemies and sacrifice their lives for his sake.[119] Most of our sources narrate, with some insignificant differences, that the Kūfans sent out numerous letters and a succession of messengers urging al-Ḥusayn to come to Kūfa to lead them, as they had no Imām other than him.[120]

The first letter that reached al-Ḥusayn was the most important one for him since it was signed by the prominent supporters of ᶜAlī in Kūfa. In this letter, they condemned Muᶜāwiya for his usurpation of the caliphate, his unjust conduct in killing the best men of the community and for dividing the property of the community among the tyrants and wealthy men. They also invited al-Ḥusayn to guide and unite them, informing him that they boycotted al-Nuᶜmān Ibn Bashīr, the governor of Kūfa, and did not join him in the

---

[118] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 29-30. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 261. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 229.
[119] Ibid., Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 29-30. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 261.
[120] Ibid., Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 29-30. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 229. Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 241. Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 3: 55. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 369-70.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

prayers. Finally, they assured al-Ḥusayn of their readiness to drive the Umayyad governor away from Kūfa as soon as they learned of his coming.[121]

The followers of ᶜAlī in Kūfa continued to inform al-Ḥusayn of their wish that he come soon. After two days, they sent him a great number of letters; each was signed by one or more than one individual for the same purpose. Two days later, al-Ḥusayn received another letter signed in the name of his Shīᶜa, asking him to make haste and telling him that they were waiting for his coming. The last letter was sent to al-Ḥusayn by a group of the leaders of the tribes, who later turned against him when Ibn Ziyād arrived in Kūfa, telling him that they had arranged everything for his arrival and confirming their readiness to fight by his side.[122]

Although the last letter was signed, "Your Shīᶜa and you father's Shīᶜā," surprisingly enough, al-Ḥusayn, according to Ibn Aᶜtham, wanted to investigate the names signed in this letter. When he asked the two messengers who brought the letter, they told him that it was signed by the leaders of the tribes of Kūfa.[123] Perhaps al-Ḥusayn was waiting for the call of the leaders of the tribes in Kūfa, who had a very strong power over Kūfan society; and wanted to be sure that their position was against the Umayyad officials and be confident of their desire for his coming. For this reason, al-Ḥusayn did not respond to the Kūfans' repeated call until he received the last letter.[124]

However, al-Ḥusayn wanted to be certain about the loyalty and sincerity of the people of Kūfa, their readiness to die for his cause and that they would not disappoint

---

[121] Ibid., 3: 369. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 31-2. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 261-2. Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 241-2. Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 3: 45.
[122] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 31-34. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 261-2. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 369-70. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 229.
[123] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 33-4.
[124] Ibid.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

him. Since they insisted on their demand and sent a huge number of letters to him, al-Ḥusayn decided to answer them at once. In his letter, al-Ḥusayn told them that he understood why they had invited him to come, stating "you have no Imām, and my arrival would unite you under truth and guidance."[125] But since he had witnessed their failure to stand fast in their support for his father and brother, al-Ḥusayn was not quite confident about their determination to fight against the Umayyad officials and, therefore, told them that he had decided to send his cousin Muslim Ibn ᶜAqīl in order to test the ground and to make sure of their devotion, as they had promised in their letters to him.[126]

Al-Ḥusayn, who had condemned Yazīd's conduct in violating Islamic norms, thus disqualifying him for the leadership of the community, explained to the Kūfans the qualifications of the real Imām, to whom the people should submit and whose cause they should follow. According to Ibn Aᶜtham and al-Ṭabarī, al-Ḥusayn declared, "The Imām is only the one who follows the Book of God; the one who upholds justice; the one who professes the religion of the truth; and the one who dedicates himself to the service of God."[127]

Likewise, when the followers of ᶜAlī in Baṣra received the news of al-Ḥusayn's refusal to give the *bayᶜa* to Yazīd and of his taking refuge in Mecca, they started to hold a series of meetings. In these meetings, they discussed the new developments and, consequently, what would be their obligation towards al-Ḥusayn, the grandson of the Prophet. Al-Ṭabarī narrates, on the authority of Abū Mikhnaf, that these meetings were held in the house of a woman called Māriya; the Shīᶜa of Baṣra used to discuss their

---

[125] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 262.
[126] Ibid. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 230. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 35-6. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 370. Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 242.
[127] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 35-6. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 262.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

affairs in this house. Yazīd Ibn Nubayṭ, an ardent supporter of al-Ḥusayn, along with his two sons decided to join al-Ḥusayn; they succeeded in joining al-Ḥusayn at Karbalā' and, finally, were killed defending him.[128] Hearing of their meetings, al-Ḥusayn wrote to the nobles of Baṣra, informing them of his determination not to submit to the Umayyad officials and asking them to support him. According to Ibn Aʿtham and al-Ṭabarī, al-Ḥusayn wrote his letter to the nobles of Baṣra before his departure from Mecca.[129]

As mentioned earlier, al-Ḥusayn declared that the Umayyad authorities would force him to pay homage to Yazīd (which he refused powerfully) or he would be killed at their hands. Therefore, he intended to prepare himself for a brutal struggle and he sought as much support as he could. In fact, this was not the only reason for al-Ḥusayn's letter to the Baṣrans. Al-Ḥusayn believed that Yazīd had distorted the Sunna of the Prophet and had revived innovation (*bidʿa*) by his irreligious practices; therefore, al-Ḥusayn, as the Prophet's grandson, was responsible for protecting the Sunna of the Prophet and the Islamic norms from any deviation. Al-Ḥusayn's responsibility was to guide the people to the right course and explain to them their obligation to follow him and submit to his decisions.

Al-Ḥusayn addressed his letter to the nobles of Baṣra, stressing the fact that he belonged to the family of the Prophet, who were entitled to the caliphate more than anyone else. He asked them to follow the Book of God and stay the course of the Sunna of the Prophet, which had been suspended by the conduct of Yazīd, while innovation had been revitalized. In order to keep the course of the Sunna of the Prophet and the Book of God, the people should follow al-Ḥusayn as their legitimate leader. Therefore, al-Ḥusayn

[128] Ibid., 4: 263.
[129] Ibid., 4: 265. Ibn Aʿtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 42.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

told the nobles of Baṣra that if they listened to his call and submitted to his orders, "I will guide you along the path of righteousness."[130]

Due to ᶜUbayd Allāh Ibn Ziyād's tough treatment of the followers of ᶜAlī, each one of the nobles who received al-Ḥusayn's letter kept silent, except al-Mundhir Ibn al-Jārūd, who was Ibn Ziyād's father-in-law. Fearing that al-Ḥusayn's messenger might be a plotter sent by Ibn Ziyād, al-Mundhir exposed the letter and brought the messenger to the governor, who ordered him to be beheaded.[131] Because of Ibn Ziyād's violent measures against his opponents, al-Ḥusayn lost the support of the people of Baṣra.

Thus, just as we saw in Chapter One, the *bayᶜa* was a key means through which Muᶜāwiya tried to secure the caliphate for himself and then for his son. However, in this chapter, we have seen that Muᶜāwiya also had to resort to force to secure allegiance for Yazīd because his lack of qualifications was too obvious-especially for the sons of the Prophet's Companions. Al-Ḥusayn, for example, was not at all willing to compromise Islamic principles for politics. Like his father, Yazīd tried to use both the *bayᶜa* and force to secure his caliphate. However, although al-Ḥusayn had been obliged to keep his pledge of allegiance to Muᶜāwiya, he could oppose Yazīd's succession, as we shall see in the next chapter.

[130] Ibid. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 265. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, pp. 231-2. Al-Ḥusayn's messenger to the nobles of Baṣra was called Sulaymān.
[131] Ibid., p. 232. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 266. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 43.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER THREE

I. Part One: Ibn ᶜAqīl's Mission

Due to his refusal to acknowledge Yazīd's caliphate and harassment from Umayyad officials, al-Ḥusayn left Medina and took refuge in Mecca. Given that Mecca was the religious center of Islam, al-Ḥusayn, by taking refuge there, perhaps intended to seize the opportunity to gather the Muslim community together and announce his opposition to Yazīd's caliphate and its illegitimacy. Mecca was also the sanctuary so he should have felt safe there. In spite of the repeated appeals and hundreds of letters sent by the Kūfans who were waiting for this opportunity to rise against the Umayyad authorities, al-Ḥusayn did not make a hasty decision to answer them and go to Kūfa. As a precautionary measure, al-Ḥusayn sent his cousin, Muslim Ibn ᶜAqīl, as his emissary with instructions to ascertain the truth and conviction of their appeals.

Before Ibn ᶜAqīl's departure from Mecca, al-Ḥusayn instructed him to make sure that the Kūfans were united and that they had committed themselves to an agreement to support his cause.[1] Ibn ᶜAqīl hired two guides for his journey. Although the two guides missed the way and were overcome by thirst and, consequently, could not continue the journey, Ibn ᶜAqīl succeeded in reaching Kūfa. Once there, he held a secret meeting in the house of al-Mukhtār al-Thaqafī (d. 67/686), a prominent Kūfan who later became a revolutionary Shīᶜī leader. At this meeting, only the nobles among al-Ḥusayn's followers

[1] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 264. Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 64. Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 3: 45. Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 242. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 38. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 230-1. Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, p. 99. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2: 334-5. Ibn Saᶜd narrates that al-Ḥusayn also instructed Ibn ᶜAqīl to reside in Hānī's house.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

were present. In order to test the sincerity of those who had written to al-Ḥusayn and invited him to be their Imām, Ibn ᶜAqīl read them a letter, addressed to the Kūfan leaders. In his letter, al-Ḥusayn wanted to examine the truthfulness of their call and their readiness to support him. In response, they all declared their undying support for al-Ḥusayn.[2]

When the news of Ibn ᶜAqīl's arrival circulated among the Kūfans, they started to come regularly to see him and to give him their oath of allegiance to al-Ḥusayn, thus confirming the eagerness and sincerity of their support for him.[3] Ibn ᶜAqīl started to collect their names to keep track of their number and ascertain that al-Ḥusayn would find enough supporters. Al-Masᶜūdī tells us that the number of people who registered their names and swore allegiance to al-Ḥusayn is variously reported as being between twelve to eighteen thousand.[4] Al-Ṭabarī also relates, on the authority of ᶜAmmār al-Duhnī, that twelve thousand people gave their *bayᶜa* to Ibn ᶜAqīl.[5] Confident of the Kūfans' sincerity in their claim to support al-Ḥusayn, Ibn ᶜAqīl wrote to his cousin, informing him of the Kūfans' eagerness for his arrival and urging him to come as soon as he received his letter.[6]

On the other hand, Ibn Saᶜd reports that when Ibn ᶜAqīl reached Kūfa, he concealed himself from the people and the Shīᶜa started to visit him, until finally, eighteen thousand people swore allegiance to al-Ḥusayn. At this time, Ibn ᶜAqīl wrote to al-Ḥusayn, telling him about the people's allegiance and urging him to come to Kūfa.[7]

---

[2] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2:344-5. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 264. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 38. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, pp. 230-1. See also Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 242.
[3] Ibid. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 38. Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, p. 99.
[4] Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 3: 54.
[5] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 258.
[6] Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 3: 54.
[7] Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 65.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The Kūfans began to visit Ibn ᶜAqīl so frequently and knowledge of his affair became so widespread that the governor of Kūfa, al-Nuᶜmān Ibn Bashīr, learned of his whereabouts. Al-Nuᶜmān warned the people about divergence and of the dreadful consequences of their sedition against the officials. He also told them, "I do not fight anyone who does not fight me, nor do I disturb those of you who remain quiet."[8]

Because of his peaceful declaration, al-Ṭabarī describes al-Nuᶜmān as a man of peace.[9] In fact, al-Ṭabarī erred in his description since we know that al-Nuᶜmān was one of Muᶜāwiya's army leaders, and as such had launched many expeditions against ᶜAlī's territories, as mentioned earlier. Al-Nuᶜmān realized that he was out of power and had few supporters to fight against Ibn ᶜAqīl, since a great number of the Kūfans, including their prominent nobles, had pledged allegiance to al-Ḥusayn and expressed their readiness to fight with him against his enemies. He perhaps realized that Ibn ᶜAqīl's mission was to test the Kūfans' loyalty to al-Ḥusayn, but not to fight against the Umayyad officials. Therefore, al-Nuᶜmān intended to avoid a confrontation with Ibn ᶜAqīl and his supporters and preferred a peaceful approach in order to calm the situation. Nevertheless, al-Nuᶜmān warned the people not to stand against the Umayyad officials and not to abolish their allegiance to Yazīd, declaring that otherwise, "I will strike you with my sword as long as its hilt remains in my hand."[10]

Some of the Umayyad's supporters were not satisfied with al-Nuᶜmān's approach to the new situation, considering it as a sign of weakness. Therefore, they wrote to Yazīd, informing him about Ibn Aqīl's arrival in Kūfa and that al-Ḥusayn's followers had sworn

---

[8] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 264. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 39. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2: 334-5. Al-Dīnwarī, *Akhbār*, p. 231.
[9] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 264.
[10] Ibid., Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 39. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2: 335. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 231.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

allegiance to him. They also told him that "the governor is a weak man or he is acting like a weak man," urging Yazīd to send a tougher governor who could deal with Ibn Aqīl in a different way.[11]

Realizing the dangerous consequences of Ibn ᶜAqīl's mission and the support given to him by al-Ḥusayn's followers, Yazīd decided to remove al-Nuᶜmān and replace him with a harsher governor who could deal strongly with the new developments in Kūfa and suppress Ibn ᶜAqīl's mission. Since Yazīd had no experience in power, he asked for help from Sarjūn, Muᶜāwiya's *mawlā* and adviser. Sarjūn counseled Yazīd to nominate ᶜUbayd Allāh Ibn Ziyād, who was then the governor of Baṣra, to be in charge of Kūfa as well, explaining to him that Ibn Ziyād was the only person who could handle the problems in Kūfa and end the rebellions. Following Sarjūn's advice, Yazīd decided to nominate Ibn Ziyād as the new governor of Kūfa.[12]

To explain why Sarjūn advised Yazīd to nominate Ibn Ziyād, al-Ṭabarī narrates that Sarjūn told Yazīd that, before his death, Muᶜāwiya was about to nominate Ibn Ziyād as governor of Kūfa. Al-Ṭabarī also relates that although he was ambivalent toward Ibn Ziyād, Yazīd did not want to oppose his father's desire and decided to follow Sarjūn's advice.[13]

It is most likely that Muᶜāwiya intended to nominate Ibn Ziyād as the governor of Kūfa although his father had refused to acknowledge Yazīd's succession to the caliphate, and Muᶜāwiya, as mentioned previously, did not disclose Yazīd's accession to the public until after Ziyād's death. Probably Yazīd was ambivalent toward Ibn Ziyād because of his

---

[11] Ibid. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 264-5. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 39-40. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2: 335. Al-Dīnawarī narrates that Muslim Ibn Saᶜīd and ᶜImāra Ibn ᶜUqba were both Yazīd's spies in Kūfa.

[12] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 40-1. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2: 335. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 231. Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 65. In his brief account, Ibn Saᶜd does not mention Sarjūn.

[13] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 265.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

father's attitude towards his accession. In fact, Sarjūn had considerable experience in handling such problems, having been Muᶜāwiya's adviser. He perhaps realized that Ibn Ziyād was the perfect man for the Kūfans, because of his cruelty and severe measures in Baṣra against the opponents of the Umayyad officials, and because of his father's reputation for brutality among the Kūfans at the time of Muᶜāwiya. Yazīd wrote to Ibn Ziyād, ordering him to go at once to Kūfa to search for Ibn ᶜAqīl and kill or expel him.[14]

According to al-Yaᶜqūbī, Yazīd wrote to Ibn Ziyād, telling him that the people of Kūfa had called al-Ḥusayn to be their leader, and that, therefore, al-Ḥusayn was heading to Kūfa. Yazīd ordered Ibn Ziyād to kill al-Ḥusayn, otherwise "you will go back to your real kinship and to your [grand] father ᶜUbayd," and warned him not to miss al-Ḥusayn.[15]

How would Ibn Ziyād succeed in his task? In fact, Sarjūn's advice to Yazīd regarding Ibn Ziyād was perfect, because Ibn Ziyād followed in the footsteps of his father in his maneuvers and in his severe measures against the opponents of the Umayyads.[16] The day before leaving Baṣra, Ibn Ziyād, as mentioned earlier, beheaded al-Ḥusayn's messenger, Sulaymān, who had been sent to some of the tribal leaders of Baṣra. Ibn Aᶜtham tells us that Ibn Ziyād beheaded al-Ḥusayn's messenger and then crucified him without giving him the opportunity to utter a word.[17] With his ruthless procedures, Ibn Ziyād intended to give the people of Baṣra a lesson and make al-Ḥusayn's messenger an example for whoever thought about revolting against the Umayyad authorities.

As soon as he received Yazīd's letter and before leaving Baṣra, Ibn Ziyād warned the Baṣrans against any rebellion or sedition against the authorities. He also notified them

---

[14] Ibid. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 3:41. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2: 335. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 231. Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 3: 57.
[15] Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 243.
[16] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 266. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 42. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2: 335.
[17] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 42.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

that if he heard of anyone opposing the officials; he would execute that person, his *ᶜarīf*,[18] his guardian, and his relatives. Ibn Ziyād then left Baṣra having left his brother ᶜUthmān as his deputy. In addition to his entourage and household, Ibn Ziyād took with him to Kūfa some of the nobles of Baṣra in order to help him in his mission.[19]

Ibn Ziyād knew that the situation in Kūfa was favorable to al-Ḥusayn and that the Kūfans were expecting al-Ḥusyan's arrival at any time. Since he had come to Kūfa with a few men, he therefore intended to deceive the Kūfans and rode into the city in disguise in order to protect himself from assassination. It was reported that when Ibn Ziyād reached Kūfa, he was wearing a black turban and was veiled. The people had no doubt that he was al-Ḥusayn and began to come out from their houses to greet him. As soon as they recognized Ibn Ziyād, they remembered how much they had suffered under his father and rushed back to their houses in fear.[20]

In another account, al-Ṭabarī narrates, on the authority of ᶜUmar Ibn Shabba, that when Ibn Ziyād left Baṣra, he had chosen five hundred persons to take with him. Because he was in a hurry and wanted to reach Kūfa as soon as he could, the rest could not keep up and fell on the ground before reaching Kūfa. Ibn Ziyād, impatient to reach Kūfa before al-Ḥusayn, arrived in Kūfa alone in disguise. When he reached the governor's palace, the governor, al-Nuᶜmān, had no doubt that he was al-Ḥusayn and, therefore, did not allow him to enter the palace. However, the governor told Ibn Ziyād that he did not intend to

---

[18] ᶜArīf (pl. *ᶜurafā'*) is the person who is incharged of the distribuation of the stipends among the inhabitants of a spesific district. "He was furthermore responsible for security inside his own *ᶜirāfa*, and probably also had other responsibilities, such as collecting blood-money and arbitrating in disputes among the members of the *ᶜirāfa*. See Saleh A. El-Ali and Cl. Cahen, "ᶜArīf," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 1: 629.
[19] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 43. Al-Ṭabarī, on the authority of Abū Mikhnaf, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 266. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2: 335. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 232.
[20] Ibid. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 266-7. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2: 335-6. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 44. Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 65. Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, pp. 99-100.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

fight him. As soon as the governor realized that he was Ibn Ziyād, he opened the doors for him. The people who had been behind Ibn Ziyād, greeting him as the grandson of the Prophet, were dispersed.[21]

This account needs some comment. It is inconceivable that none of the five hundred who accompanied Ibn Ziyād from Baṣra reached Kūfa with him. Indeed, they must have reached Kūfa after Ibn Ziyad and played a significant role there. Nevertheless, none of the sources mention their role, even al-Ṭabarī himself. This sheds many doubts on the credibility of Ibn Shabba's account. Perhaps Ibn Shabba intended to exaggerate the details of Ibn Ziyād's arrival in Kūfa and his ruthless attitude. However, a similar version of Ibn Shabba's description of Ibn Ziyād's arrival in Kūfa is narrated by al-Masᶜūdī, except that the latter does not mention the five hundred people. Rather, al-Masᶜūdī relates that when the people discovered that the man who had arrived in Kūfa in disguise was Ibn Ziyād, they started stoning him but he escaped and entered the palace.[22]

The next day, Ibn Ziyād asked that all the people be summoned to the mosque and informed them that the caliph, Yazīd, had appointed him as the new governor. He also told them that Yazīd had instructed him to treat whoever submitted to his orders kindly but to be ruthless with those who opposed him, and that he was going to follow Yazīd's instructions.[23]

Ibn Ziyād had no support to rely on when he arrived in Kūfa and perhaps did not want to agitate the people against him; perhaps he intended rather to test the Kūfans' attitude and their reactions towards him. Since no opposition was raised against his

---

[21] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 268.
[22] Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 3: 57.
[23] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 44. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 267. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2: 355-6. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 232-3. Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, p. 101. Al-Ṭabarī adds that Ibn Ziyād also said "and my sword will be against whoever is opposed to my orders."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

appointment and his speech, Ibn Ziyād felt that they were afraid of him. According to Ibn A^{c}tham, Ibn Ziyād, on the day after his speech, came out to the people showing a different character and another face. He told them that he would punish even the innocent people because of their relatives' mistakes and disobedience.[24] Now Ibn Ziyād exposed his real attitude to the Kūfans and his father's face and character which terrified them and from which they had greatly suffered for several years.

Ibn Ziyād's immediate tasks were to crush those who constituted a threat for the Umayyad officials and to find out Ibn ^{c}Aqīl's whereabouts. Al-Ṭabarī tells us that Ibn Ziyād started to treat the people very harshly. He ordered the *^{c}urafā'* to write to him about troublemakers: "those among you who are sought by the Commander of the Faithful, the troublemakers whose concern is discord and turmoil." He also threatened those among the *^{c}urafā'* who did not submit to his orders that he would shed their blood and destroy their property, and told them that if he found anyone who was wanted by the Commander of the Faithful in any *^{c}arīf*'s area, the *^{c}arīf* would be crucified at the door of his house and be deprived of his payment (*^{c}aṭā'*).[25] In order to protect themselves, their property and their fellow tribespeople from Ibn Ziyād's severe punishments, the *^{c}urafā'* submitted to Ibn Ziyād's orders and, therefore, facilitated his task. In fact, they were the easiest means by which the new governor enhanced his power in Kūfa.

After Ibn Ziyād's arrival in Kūfa, his threatening speech and harsh treatment of the *^{c}urafā'*, Ibn ^{c}Aqīl realized that he was in danger and, therefore, decided to change his place of residence and move to the house of Hānī Ibn ^{c}Urwa, one of the prominent Kūfan leaders. Although Hānī was reluctant to host Ibn ^{c}Aqīl, fearing Ibn Ziyād's wrath, he was

---

[24] Ibn A^{c}tham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 45.
[25] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 267.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

not able to reject Ibn ᶜAqīl's request and allowed him to stay in his house. Meanwhile, al-Ḥusayn's supporters continued to visit Ibn ᶜAqīl and swear allegiance to al-Ḥusayn secretly in order to keep their affair hidden from the brutal new governor.[26]

At this time, according to al-Ṭabarī, Ibn ᶜAqīl wrote to al-Ḥusayn, informing him that he had collected twelve thousand oaths of allegiance from the Kūfans and urging him to come.[27] It is very likely that Ibn ᶜAqīl did write to al-Ḥusayn and urge him to come to Kūfa at this time, since he had received such strong promises of allegiance and was certain that the Kūfans were sincere in their letters and their call to al-Ḥusayn.

At about this time, Ibn ᶜAqīl had a unique opportunity to assassinate Ibn Ziyād and, in so doing, gain full control over the situation in Kūfa, but he did not seize this opportunity. Our sources tell us that Sharīk Ibn al-Aᶜwar, who was one of ᶜAlī's followers and who had come with Ibn Ziyād from Baṣra, became sick while he was residing in Hānī's house. When Ibn Ziyād heard of his sickness he decided to visit him. Sharīk told Ibn Aᶜqīl, who was residing in Hānī's house as well, to seize this opportunity to assassinate Ibn Ziyād and get rid of him. When Ibn Ziyād visited Sharīk, Ibn ᶜAqīl refused to murder him, even when Sharīk raised his voice, reciting some poems as a sign to Ibn ᶜAqīl to come out and kill Ibn Ziyād. However, Ibn ᶜAqīl failed to kill Ibn Ziyād and the latter escaped the assassination, leaving Ibn Hānī's house. When Sharīk reproached Ibn ᶜAqīl for not killing Ibn Ziyād, Ibn ᶜAqīl explained that he refused to do so for two reasons: first, Hānī was reluctant to see Ibn Ziyād killed in his house, and, second, because he remembered the Prophet's statement that the true Muslim does not

---

[26] Ibid., 4: 270. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 45-6. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 233. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2: 336. Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 3: 58.

[27] Al-Ṭabarī, on the authority of ᶜAmmār al-Duhnī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 258-9. As noted earlier, Ibn Saᶜd reports that Ibn ᶜAqīl wrote to al-Ḥusayn, urging him to come to Kūfa when eighteen thousand swore allegiance to al-Ḥusayn. Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 65.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

commit assassinations and, therefore, Ibn ᶜAqīl had no desire to disobey the Prophet's instructions.[28] In addition to the fact that Ibn ᶜAqīl was not instructed by al-Ḥusayn to attack the Umayyad officials, it would have been shameful for Ibn ᶜAqīl, among the people of Kūfa, to assassinate a visitor without fighting.

In his narration of this event, Ibn Saᶜd provides a different account. He does not mention Ibn ᶜAqīl's chance to assassinate Ibn Ziyād; rather, he reports that Ibn ᶜAqīl did not know when Ibn Ziyād visited Sharīk in Hānī's house while he was sick. Ibn Saᶜd also relates that Hānī and Sharīk both decided to murder Ibn Ziyād. They prepared thirty men to assassinate Ibn Ziyād as soon as he came to Hānī's house. However, Ibn Ziyād had noticed that something bizarre was going on in Hānī's house and, therefore, escaped the assassination and left the house rapidly.[29]

It is difficult to conceive that Ibn ᶜAqīl was unaware of Ibn Ziyād's visit to Hānī's house, given that he was hiding from him. Therefore, a vital question which needs to be answered in regards to Ibn Saᶜd's narration is: Why did Hānī and Sharīk not tell Ibn ᶜAqīl that they had prepared to assassinate Ibn Ziyād? Perhaps they knew that Ibn ᶜAqīl would not agree with their intention and he would be hesitant to murder Ibn Ziyād, therefore, hid their plan from him.

The most important task for Ibn Ziyād was to find out Ibn ᶜAqīl's whereabouts in order to cut off the opposition at its root. In order to achieve his purpose, Ibn Ziyād resorted to trickery; summoning his *mawlā*, Maᶜqil, and giving him three thousand dirhams to look for Ibn ᶜAqīl and search out his followers. Ibn Ziyād ordered him to pose

---

[28] Tabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 270-1. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 47-9. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, pp. 234-5. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2: 337. Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, p. 101-2. Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 243. Al-Yaᶜqūbī contradicts other sources by stating that Hānī was sick.
[29] Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 67.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

as one of al-Ḥusayn's supporters who had come to give money to Ibn ᶜAqīl's agent in order to strengthen Ibn ᶜAqīl's position. Ibn Ziyād's *mawlā* succeeded in finding Muslim Ibn ᶜAwsaja, who was in charge of receiving the oath of allegiance for al-Ḥusayn, and told him his story. Ibn ᶜAwsaja introduced him to Ibn ᶜAqīl who in his turn took the money from him and accepted his allegiance. Ibn Ziyād's *mawlā* started to visit Ibn ᶜAqīl regularly; he was the first to enter Hānī's house and the last to leave it each day in order to become acquainted with all the details of Ibn ᶜAqīl's affairs, as he had been instructed by Ibn Ziyād. [30]

Ibn Ziyād, now knew about Ibn ᶜAqīl's whereabouts from his *mawlā*, and, therefore, arranged to bring Hānī to the palace in order to capture Ibn ᶜAqīl. He complained to the nobles of Kūfa about Hānī's failure to visit the governor and asked why he did not come to visit him like the others. He asked Hānī's associates to persuade him to come to the governor's palace. Since Hānī was protecting Ibn ᶜAqīl in his house, he was afraid to visit Ibn Ziyād in his palace and pretended that he was sick. Although Hānī expressed his fear of meeting with Ibn Ziyād because of the latter's ruthless character, a group of prominent persons of his tribe, Madhhij, succeeded in convincing him to come with them to the governor's palace.[31]

Hānī's associates did not know about the story of Ibn Ziyād's *mawlā* or that Ibn Ziyād knew everything about Ibn ᶜAqīl's affairs through him. Furthermore, because of Hānī's leading position in his tribe, they did not anticipate that Ibn Ziyād would treat Hānī in such a very merciless way. By bringing Hānī to his palace, they merely intended to

---

[30] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 46-7. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, pp. 235-6. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2: 337. Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, pp. 100-1. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 270. It should be noted that al-Ṭabarī does not mention the name of Ibn ᶜAwsaja; instead he cites the word '*shaykh*.'

[31] Ibid., 4: 272-4. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 52-5. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, pp. 263-8. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2: 337-8. Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 3: 57.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

prove their loyalty to Ibn Ziyād and their submission to him in order to protect themselves from his brutality and to maintain their *ᶜaṭā'*. In fact, these prominent leaders of the tribes in Kūfa had sent a letter to al-Ḥusayn while he was in Mecca, urging him to lead them against the Umayyad officials. Although they shared with al-Ḥusayn his resistance to the Umayyad authorities, they had a habit of looking out for their own benefits. Their priority was to secure their position and protect their property and the ties among their tribes. Therefore, as soon as affairs in Kūfa turned against Ibn ᶜAqīl, they changed their attitude and turned against al-Ḥusayn and his emissary. In fact, they played a significant role in facilitating Ibn Ziyād's task of subduing Ibn ᶜAqīl's mission by influencing the members of their tribes and the inhabitants of Kūfa to withdraw from Ibn ᶜAqīl's cause.

Ibn Saᶜd narrates that Asmā' Ibn Khārija and ᶜAmr Ibn al-Ḥajjāj, prominent associates of Hānī's, promised Hānī that no harm would reach him from Ibn Ziyād, but when the latter killed him, it was obvious that they could not keep their promise and none of them dared to raise a voice in protest in front of the governor.[32]

Meanwhile, Ibn Ziyād ordered his men to keep watch over the main roads of Kūfa, searching for Ibn ᶜAqīl's supporters and searching whoever entered or left Kūfa. According to Ibn Aᶜtham, ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn Yarbūᶜ al-Tamīmī, one of Ibn Ziyād's men, noticed a man leaving Kūfa rapidly. Suspecting that he might be one of al-Ḥusayn's followers, al-Tamīmī searched the man and found that he was holding a letter. He told Ibn Ziyād about the man and handed him his letter. When Ibn Ziyād examined the letter, he found out that it was from Ibn ᶜAqīl to al-Ḥusayn. In his letter, Ibn ᶜAqīl informed al-Ḥusayn that more than twenty thousand people had pledged allegiance to him and urged

[32] Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 67

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

him to come to Kūfa as soon as possible, explaining that the people did not have any desire for Yazīd. When Ibn Ziyād asked the man, who was named ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn Yaqṭīn, about the origin of the letter, the latter declined to tell him. Consequently, Ibn Ziyād ordered him to be executed.[33]

When Hānī was brought to the palace, Ibn Ziyād reproached him for protecting Ibn ᶜAqīl in his house and for collecting men and raising an army to support Ibn ᶜAqīl's mission. At first, Hānī denied that he was hiding Ibn ᶜAqīl in his house, but when Ibn Ziyād brought in his spy who knew every single detail of Ibn ᶜAqīl's affair, Hānī admitted that Ibn ᶜAqīl was hiding in his house. However, Hānī explained to Ibn Ziyād that he did so only because Ibn ᶜAqīl had made a request to stay in his house, at which point Hānī could not refuse him. Furthermore, Hānī promised Ibn Ziyād that he was ready to ask Ibn ᶜAqīl to leave his house, but Ibn Ziyād refused this offer, demanding that he bring Ibn ᶜAqīl to the palace immediately. Hānī strongly rejected this demand from Ibn Ziyād and swore by God that if Ibn ᶜAqīl were at Hanī's two feet, he would not lift them and allow him to be given to Ibn Ziyād. Hānī also explained to Ibn Ziyād that it would be a shame on him, Hānī, until the rest of his life, if he did not protect his guest. Hānī believed that his men would be able to protect him from Ibn Ziyād, but he was wrong. When Hānī persisted in refusing Ibn Ziyād's demand, Ibn Ziyād struck his face with his cane and ordered him to be imprisoned in the palace.[34]

In his account, al-Dīnawarī narrates that Ibn Ziyād killed Hānī when the latter refused to give him Ibn ᶜAqīl.[35] In addition to the fact that this account contradicts other accounts,

---

[33] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 50-1.
[34] Ibid., 3: 52-3. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 272-4. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2: 337-8. Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 3: 57. Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, p. 102.
[35] Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, pp. 263-8.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

it is unlikely that Ibn Ziyād killed Hānī at this time since he would have lost the support of Hānī's tribe, whereas he was still in need of them to maintain his power.

Ibn Sa^{c}d also tells us that Hānī was killed at the hands of Ibn Ziyād after a harsh dispute between them. He narrates that when Hānī was asked by Ibn Ziyād why he had hidden his enemy, Hānī responded that Ibn ^{c}Aqīl had come to the people of Kūfa with a truth which was "more authoritative than your claim and your family's claim." Therefore, Ibn Ziyād struck Hānī's head until he died.[36] According to Ibn Sa^{c}d's account, Hānī confronted Ibn Ziyād with the fact that he and his family had no right to rule the people in the name of the caliphate and that Ibn ^{c}Aqīl was calling for the truth when he asked the people to support and pay homage to al-Ḥusayn. In addition to the fact that Ibn Sa^{c}d's account is not supported by the majority of our sources, it is unlikely that Hānī would confront Ibn Ziyād with such a strong statement while he was powerless. Perhaps Hānī did so, if we accept for a moment Ibn Sa^{c}d's account, because he thought that he could still rely on the support of his tribe and his associates to protect him from the wrath of Ibn Ziyād.

Rumors had begun to spread among the people of Kūfa that Hānī had been killed in the governor's palace. Hearing of these rumors, ^{c}Amr Ibn al-Ḥajjāj, one of the members of Hānī's tribe who had submitted to Ibn Ziyād, came to the governor's palace with a great number of Hānī's tribe, the Madhḥij, in order to avenge Hānī's killing. He told Ibn Ziyād that the members of Hānī's tribe had not abolished their loyalty to the governor and were not seeking sedition, but that they had heard that Hānī was murdered and, therefore, had come to be sure that he was still alive. Ibn Ziyād ordered Shurayḥ al-Qāḍī (d. 78/697), one of the judges who worked on behalf of the Umayyad authorities, to look at

[36] Ibn Sa^{c}d, *Maqtal*, p. 66.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Hānī and tell them that he was alive. Trusting Shurayḥ's testimony and his trustworthiness, when they heard that Hānī was still alive, his men became calm and left the palace.[37]

According to al-Ṭabarī, on the authority of ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn Shurayḥ, when Shurayḥ came to look at Hānī, the latter, who had recognized the sounds of his men outside the palace, asked Shurayḥ to inform his people about his fate and to request them to come to his rescue. Shurayḥ claimed that he intended to tell them about Hānī's situation and ask them to rescue him from prison, but he was afraid of Ibn Ziyād's spy, Ḥumayd Ibn Bukayr, who was following him. Shurayḥ only told the Madhḥij that Hānī was alive.[38]

It is clear that the people of Kūfa had lost their power and determination because of Ibn Ziyād's severe measures against whoever opposed him. Even Shurayḥ al-Qāḍī, who was responsible for establishing justice among the people, lost his resolution out of fear and was not able to object to Ibn Ziyād's harsh treatment of Hānī. They were all terrified of the dangerous consequences of opposing Ibn Ziyād's orders. It is reported that when Ibn Ziyād imprisoned Hānī, he wondered whether the people of Kūfa would revolt against him. Therefore, he enjoined them to keep their loyalty to their leaders and not oppose them. Otherwise, he warned, they would expose themselves to being deprived of their rights, humiliated and killed.[39]

Since Ibn Ziyād had taken severe measures against Ibn ᶜAqīl and his supporters, imprisoning Hānī, Ibn ᶜAqīl, in his turn, decided to attack the Umayyad officials. He prepared to assault the governor's palace in order to rescue Hānī from his prison and

[37] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 274-5. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 55. Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 3: 57.
[38] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 274-5.
[39] Ibid., 4: 275. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 55. Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, pp. 102-3.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

spread the battle cry. Eighteen thousand men responded to his call. He sent forward his vanguard and drew up his right and left wings, and he himself advanced with the center toward Ibn Ziyād's palace. When Ibn Ziyād was informed of Ibn ᶜAqīl's coming, he barricaded himself in the palace and locked the gates.[40]

Although Ibn ᶜAqīl was not instructed to fight against the Umayyad authorities, he was forced to call for a movement against Ibn Ziyād because of his severe measures and ill treatment of al-Ḥusayn's supporters. Ibn ᶜAqīl recognized that Ibn Ziyād's intention was to crush his supporters and abort his mission and, therefore, decided to attack him. The most important question that presents itself here is: Why did Ibn ᶜAqīl not succeed in controlling the situation in Kūfa although he had surrounded the governor's palace with his men? At the beginning, Ibn ᶜAqīl had succeeded in his mission when al-Ḥusayn sent him to Kūfa; the people of Kūfa had rallied around him and he had collected the names of more than twelve thousand people who pledged allegiance to al-Ḥusayn. The situation had changed only since Ibn Ziyād arrived in Kūfa. Three main reasons were behind Ibn ᶜAqīl's failure to control the situation upon Ibn Ziyād's arrival in Kūfa: first, the Kūfan's failure to keep their word; second, the role of the nobles of Kūfa; and third, Ibn Ziyād's severe measures and maneuvers. We have already mentioned Ibn Ziyād's harsh treatment of the *ᶜurafā'* and his ploy to uncover Ibn ᶜAqīl's whereabouts using his spy.

Although eighteen thousand people had pledged allegiance to Ibn ᶜAqīl, according to al-Balādhurī, only four thousand followed him to the governor's palace, which means that most of Ibn ᶜAqīl's followers did not keep their word. In addition, al-Ṭabarī narrates, on the authority of Abū Mikhnaf, that four thousand people were with Ibn ᶜAqīl when he

[40] Ibid. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 56. Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 3: 58. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2: 338. Al-Balādhurī narrates that although eighteen thousand men complied with Ibn ᶜAqīl's call, only four thousand followed him to the governor's palace.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

decided to attack the palace. Although the people had gathered in the mosque and in the market, only three hundred persons followed Ibn ᶜAqīl to the palace.[41] Ibn Saᶜd reports that four hundred people responded to Ibn ᶜAqīl's call, but only sixteen of them followed him to the governor's palace.[42] All these accounts confirm that most of Ibn ᶜAqīl's supporters, despite pledging allegiance to him, failed to keep their promises to join him in fighting against the enemy.

Indeed, Ibn Ziyād's power was limited; he had no supporters except some of his close associates who had come with him from Baṣra and a small number of the tribal leaders (*ashrāf al-qabā'il*) who, out of fear of his brutality and his severe measures, turned away from Ibn ᶜAqīl and took Ibn Ziyād's side. Al-Ṭabarī narrates that some of the tribal leaders started to withdraw from Ibn ᶜAqīl and join Ibn Ziyād in his palace.[43] It should be mentioned that some of these nobles who wrote to al-Ḥusayn and expressed their readiness to fight with him against the Umayyad authorities, were from among the *Khawārij* who had fought against his father and had injured his brother, as mentioned earlier. They had called al-Ḥusayn, not because they believed in his right to the caliphate, but because they shared in his opposition to the Umayyads and, therefore, intended to fight alongside him in order to remove the Umayyad officials from their offices. Since they had experienced Ibn Ziyād's severe measures against their friends in Baṣra, they tried to avoid his wrath and, therefore, turned against Ibn ᶜAqīl and took Ibn Ziyād's part.

Noticing that the Kūfans were leaning towards al-Ḥusayn and that his hold on power was tenuous, Ibn Ziyād used the nobles to threaten and influence the members of their tribes to withdraw from Ibn ᶜAqīl. Ibn Aᶜtham, al-Ṭabarī and al-Isfahānī narrate that

[41] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 275-6.
[42] Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 66.
[43] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 276.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Kathīr Ibn Shihāb, one of the Kūfan nobles who was from the *Khawārij*, was shouting to the people, warning them not to kill themselves and their families. He explained to them that the Syrian army was coming and that Ibn Ziyād had decided to deprive them of their payment (*ᶜaṭā'*), to scatter their men in the Syrian campaigns and to kill even the innocents among them if they persisted in fighting him. When the Kūfans heard his statement, they scattered and withdrew from Ibn ᶜAqīl, advising each other not to expose themselves to the wrath of the governor and to stay in their houses.[44]

In fact, the nobles played a major role in threatening the people and making them withdraw from Ibn ᶜAqīl's cause. They also played a significant role in the fight against Ibn ᶜAqīl and imprisoned some of his supporters. Al-Ṭabarī, al-Isfahānī and al-Dīnawarī tell us that Ibn Ziyād summoned these nobles and ordered them to go around Kūfa, dissuading the people from disobedience, making them afraid of the Syrian troops and threatening them with punishment. Ibn Ziyād also instructed them to guarantee safe-conduct to those people who withdrew from Ibn ᶜAqīl and joined him. He offered additional money and kind treatment to those who would submit to the Umayyad officials and terrified the disobedient with threats of dispossession and terrible punishment. Following Ibn Ziyād's orders, the nobles of Kūfa warned the people not to expose themselves to death, telling them that the army of the caliph was approaching. They also warned the people that the governor would deprive their offspring of their rights to the state allotment of money (*ᶜaṭā'*) and that he would scatter them in Syrian campaigns if they persisted in opposing him. Hearing this, and in order to protect themselves, their

[44] Ibid., 4: 277. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 56. al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, pp. 103-4.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

relatives and their property, the people of Kūfa started to disperse and the women began to come to their sons and brothers, asking them to withdraw from Ibn ᶜAqīl.[45]

Not only did the tribal leaders of Kūfa withdraw from Ibn ᶜAqīl's cause, but they also fought against him. Al-Ṭabarī reports that these nobles, with some of their tribesmen, confronted Ibn ᶜAqīl and his supporters as they approached the governor's palace while Ibn Ziyād, his family and his close associates took refuge in the palace.[46] According to al-Dīnawarī and Ibn Saᶜd, a small confrontation between Ibn ᶜAqīl's supporters and Ibn Ziyād's men took place at the gate of the governor's palace.[47] Although al-Dīnawarī and Ibn Saᶜd do not mention the names of Ibn Ziyād's men, they were most likely the Kūfan nobles who were used by Ibn Aᶜtham's account, according to which a great fight between Ibn ᶜAqīl's men and Ibn Ziyād's men took place outside the governor's palace while Ibn Ziyād and his close associates watched from the top of the palace.[48] Since Ibn Ziyād had no men with which to confront Ibn ᶜAqīl's huge group of supporters,[49] there should be no reason to doubt that it was the tribal leaders of Kūfa who indeed confronted and fought against Ibn ᶜAqīl on behalf of Ibn Ziyād.

The tribal leaders of Kūfa also played a noteworthy role in pursuing Ibn ᶜAqīl's followers and bringing them to Ibn Ziyād. Al-Ṭabarī reports that the Kūfans' tribal leaders captured some of Ibn ᶜAqīl's supporters and brought them to Ibn Ziyād who, in turn, imprisoned them and, consequently, beheaded them.[50] Al-Balādhurī also narrates

---

[45] Ibid., p. 104. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 276-7. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 239.
[46] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 276-7.
[47] Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 239. Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 66.
[48] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 56.
[49] Al-Ṭabarī and al-Balādhurī narrate that Ibn Ziyād had only fifty persons with him in the palace. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 276. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2: 338.
[50] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 276, 284-6.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

that when ᶜUmāra al-Azdī wanted to join Ibn ᶜAqīl, Ibn Ziyād's men captured him and brought him to Ibn Ziyād, who beheaded him and sent his head to Yazīd.[51]

The failure of Ibn ᶜAqīl's followers to keep their word and fight alongside him is further indicated by the report that they continued to slip away from him, so that Ibn ᶜAqīl, when the darkness spread, found himself alone with no support. He had no shelter to resort to until an old woman called Ṭawᶜa permitted him to stay in her house as soon as she recognized him.[52] Having secured himself from the Kūfans' rebellion and Ibn ᶜAqīl's attack, Ibn Ziyād's task, after the failure of Ibn ᶜAqīl's movement, was to capture Ibn ᶜAqīl himself. Therefore, he summoned the people to the mosque, ordering them to keep their allegiance and submission to Yazīd, and warning that whoever protected Ibn ᶜAqīl in his house was to be killed. Ibn Ziyād also promised a large reward for the one who could bring Ibn ᶜAqīl to the governor. He also asked al-Ḥuṣayn Ibn Tamīm, the leader of Ibn Ziyād's army, to search for Ibn ᶜAqīl in the streets of Kūfa and in every house.[53]

The son of the woman Ṭawᶜa was one of Ibn Ziyād's supporters and was searching for Ibn ᶜAqīl in order to gain the reward. When he came to his mother's house, he recognized Ibn ᶜAqīl and, consequently, told Ibn Ziyād about his whereabouts. Ibn Ziyād sent the commander of his police together with seventy men to arrest Ibn ᶜAqīl. They surrounded the house and Ibn ᶜAqīl fought them energetically until he was exhausted but initially refused to surrender. He finally surrendered and accepted their offer to go with

---

[51] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2: 431.
[52] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 277-8. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 58-9. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2: 338-9. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 239. Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 66. Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, p. 104.
[53] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 278-9. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 59.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

them to the governor's palace only when Muḥammad Ibn al-Ashᶜath, the commander of Ibn Ziyād's men, promised him safe-conduct from the governor.[54]

On the other hand, Ibn Aᶜtham narrates that Ibn Ziyād, in fact, arranged to offer safe-conduct to Ibn ᶜAqīl in order to protect his men from him. Ibn Aᶜtham tells us that Ibn Ziyād sent three hundred men with his commander Ibn al-Ashᶜath to capture Ibn ᶜAqīl. When Ibn Ziyād was told that Ibn ᶜAqīl had killed a large number of his men, he tried to deceive Ibn ᶜAqīl and, therefore, arranged with Ibn al-Ashᶜath to guarantee safe-conduct for Ibn ᶜAqīl. Nevertheless, Ibn ᶜAqīl refused to surrender and continued fighting until he was exhausted from thirst.[55]

It is most likely that Ibn ᶜAqīl would not have accepted safe-conduct since he knew that Ibn al-Ashᶜath had no power to keep his promises. Ibn ᶜAqīl had also witnessed that Ibn al-Ashᶜath and his associates were not able to raise their voices in front of Ibn Ziyād and had not dared to save their leader Hānī from the hands of Ibn Ziyād when the latter imprisoned him. Therefore, it is more conceivable that Ibn ᶜAqīl surrendered only when he was unable to fight, even if Ibn al-Ashᶜath did promise to guarantee him safe-conduct. This is further supported by al-Ṭabarī and al-Balādhurī's account that, when Ibn al-Ashᶜath told Ibn al-Ziyād about his safe-conduct to Ibn ᶜAqīl, Ibn Ziyād reproached Ibn al-Ashᶜath for his promise, informing him that he had no authority to give such a guarantee.[56]

When Ibn ᶜAqīl was brought to the palace, a crucial dialogue between him and Ibn Ziyād took place. Ibn Ziyād considered Ibn ᶜAqīl to be a rebel against the rightful caliph

---

[54] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 279-80. Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 3: 58. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2: 338-9. Al-Dīnawarī, *Ahkbār*, p. 240. Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, pp. 106-7.
[55] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 60-65.
[56] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 281. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2: 339.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and his officials, accusing him of creating mayhem by dividing the people and making chaos among them. He said to Ibn ᶜAqīl, "You came to the people while they were united and their affairs were solid; you came to them only to divide their unity and to disturb them." Ibn ᶜAqīl denied that he had come for this purpose, arguing that the people of Kūfa were claiming that "your father killed their best men and shed their blood." He declared that his mission was to enjoin justice among the people of Kūfa and to call them to follow the rules of the Qur'ān. Ibn Ziyād tried to undermine Ibn ᶜAqīl's position by accusing him of violating Islamic norms by drinking wine. Ibn ᶜAqīl, however, rejected this accusation and pointed out that it was Yazīd who was more correctly described as a drinker of wine. He further described Yazīd as one who bathed in the blood of Muslims, killed the innocent, and shed sacred blood, while acting as if he had done nothing. Ibn Ziyād denied Ibn ᶜAqīl's assertion that he had come to prevent corruption caused by Yazīd's conduct, insisting that Yazīd was entitled to the caliphate. He ordered Ibn ᶜAqīl to be taken to the top of the palace and beheaded.[57]

Because of the Kūfans' lack of resolution and their failure to support and to fight alongside him, Ibn ᶜAqīl was confident that if al-Ḥusayn came to Kūfa he would not find any supporters there and, consequently, would be killed. Therefore, before his death, Ibn ᶜAqīl requested that ᶜUmar Ibn Saᶜd send a messenger to al-Ḥusayn, informing him of his fate and the instability of the Kūfans, and advising him not to trust them and not to come to Kūfa. Ibn Ziyād, who was instructed by Yazīd to strive to his utmost not to allow al-

[57] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 282-3. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 62-7. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2: 339-41. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, pp. 240-1. Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 3: 58. Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, pp. 107-9.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Ḥusayn to enter Kūfa in order to keep him from his supporters and avoid rebellion against the Umayyad authorities, permitted Ibn Sa^{c}d to send an envoy to al-Ḥusayn.[58]

Muḥammad Ibn al-Ash^{c}ath, who had brought Hānī to Ibn Ziyād, feared the enmity of Hānī's tribesmen because of Hānī's leading position among his people and, therefore, requested that Ibn Ziyād release Hānī. Although Ibn Ziyād had promised Ibn al-Ash^{c}ath that he would liberate Hānī, he changed his mind and ordered Hānī to be taken to the market and beheaded. In the market, Hānī looked for help and called for his tribe to release him, but nobody dared to help him and, consequently, he was beheaded.[59]

Ibn Ziyād intended to make Hānī an example for anyone who intended to oppose the Umayyad authorities. For this reason, he broke his promise to Ibn al-Ash^{c}ath and beheaded Hānī. Furthermore, by this act, Ibn Ziyād showed to Kūfans his brutal treatment of his enemies, so that the people of Kūfa would realize the dangerous consequences of supporting or joining al-Ḥusayn.

Finally, Ibn Ziyād sent Ibn ^{c}Aqīl's and Hānī's heads to Yazīd with a letter, informing him of his acts. Yazīd was satisfied with Ibn Ziyād's treatment of his enemies and admired his behavior and loyalty. However, Yazīd was still very concerned about al-Ḥusayn, who had decided to comply with the Kūfans' call. Therefore, Yazīd instructed Ibn Ziyād to put his troops on the roads and detain any suspicious people, and to arrest anyone who was accused of being with al-Ḥusayn. He also instructed Ibn Ziyād to write to him about any new developments.[60]

---

[58] Ibn Sa^{c}d, *Maqtal*, p. 66. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 282. Ibn A^{c}tham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 66. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, pp. 240-1.

[59] Ibn Sa^{c}d, *Maqtal*, p. 66. Ibn A^{c}tham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 67-8. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2: 340. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 284.

[60] Ibid., 4: 285-6. Ibn A^{c}tham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 69-70. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 2: 342.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

II. Part Two: Al-Ḥusayn's Route to Kūfa

As mentioned earlier, Ibn ᶜAqīl wrote to al-Ḥusayn, informing him of the pledges of allegiance he had collected from the Kūfans and their readiness to sacrifice themselves for his cause, urging him to come to Kūfa as soon as his letter reached him. Upon receiving Ibn ᶜAqīl's letter, al-Ḥusayn decided to go to Kūfa. A group of prominent people who mostly lived in Mecca and Medina, among whom were some Companions of the Prophet and sons of prominent Companions, disagreed with al-Ḥusayn's decision. A group of the Banū Hāshim, including Ibn ᶜAbbās, Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya and Ibn Jaᶜfar, requested that al-Ḥusayn stay in Mecca and not expose himself to death at the hands of the Umayyad authorities, but al-Ḥusayn refused to comply.

Ibn ᶜAbbās opposed al-Ḥusayn's plan, believing that Kūfa was an unsafe place. He argued that al-Ḥusayn should depart for Kūfa only when he was sure that its inhabitants had full control over their city and had expelled their enemies from it. Since the people of Kūfa did not have full power over the situation in Kūfa, they, according to Ibn ᶜAbbās' argument, were, in fact, calling him to war but, might fail to support al-Ḥusayn. In fact, Ibn ᶜAbbās was not unaware of the changeable attitude of the Kūfans, given that he had witnessed their failure to support both ᶜAlī and al-Ḥasan against Muᶜāwiya. For this reason, he strongly disagreed with al-Ḥusayn's intention to comply with the Kūfans' call. In order to reduce the danger from the Umayyads, Ibn ᶜAbbās recommended that al-Ḥusayn go to Yemen, where many supporters of ᶜAlī resided. Ibn ᶜAbbās also suggested that al-Ḥusayn write to the people of Kūfa while he was residing in Yemen until he

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

became confident of their loyalty. However, al-Ḥusayn refused Ibn ᶜAbbās's suggestions and told him that he had already made his decision to go to Kūfa.[61]

Ibn ᶜAbbās' suggestion that al-Ḥusayn reside in Yemen is likewise attributed to Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya, al-Ḥusayn's half-brother. According to Ibn Aᶜtham, Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya advised al-Ḥusayn to stay in Mecca. When al-Ḥusayn refused, Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya suggested that he go to Yemen. He also advised al-Ḥusayn not to make a hasty decision but to wait for the development of affairs in Kūfa. Nevertheless, al-Ḥusayn did not listen to his brother's advice and decided to leave Mecca for Kūfa.[62]

ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn Jaᶜfar tried his utmost to prevent al-Ḥusayn's departure, but failed. Al-Ṭabarī reports that while Ibn Jaᶜfar was in Medina, the news of al-Ḥusayn's decision to go to Kūfa reached him. Ibn Jaᶜfar sent a letter to al-Ḥusayn with his two sons, requesting that he stay in Mecca and wait for him to come. In order to protect al-Ḥusayn from any harassment by the Umayyad officials in Mecca, Ibn Jaᶜfar succeeded in securing safe-conduct for him from the governor of Mecca. Nevertheless, al-Ḥusayn refused the governor's guarantee of security and decided to continue his journey to Kūfa.[63]

It should be noted that these prominent members of the Banū Hahsim who advised al-Ḥusayn to stay in Mecca did not recommend that he recognize Yazīd's caliphate or put his hand in Yazīd's; rather, they merely advised him not to go to Kūfa but to take refuge in any other place.

Another group of prominent persons, on the other hand, also disagreed with al-Ḥusayn's decision to go to Kūfa but were of the opinion that al-Ḥusayn should pay

---

[61] Ibid., 3: 373-4. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 288. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, pp. 243-4. Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, p. 110. Ibn Saᶜd briefly mentions this account. Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 56.
[62] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 22.
[63] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4:291-2.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

homage to Yazīd. Although they criticized Yazīd for his violation of Islamic principles, did not acknowledge his entitlement to the caliphate and also admitted al-Ḥusayn's higher status given his close relationship to the Prophet, they disagreed with al-Ḥusayn's revolt against Yazīd. They predicted that al-Ḥusayn would be killed at the hands of the Umayyad authorities if he rose against Yazīd, and that this would cause damage to the Muslim community. Therefore, they believed that if al-Ḥusayn swore allegiance to Yazīd it would be better for the community than to revolt against him. They thought that al-Ḥusayn should agree to whatever the community (*jamāᶜa*) agreed upon and, therefore, tried to persuade him not to comply with the call of the inhabitants of Kūfa. They recommended that al-Ḥusayn stay in his home and pay homage to Yazīd.

In this respect, Ibn Saᶜd collects many names of those inhabitants of Mecca and Medina, who asked al-Ḥusayn not to revolt against Yazīd and advised him to go back and stay in his home. For instance, Ibn Saᶜd relates that ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn ᶜAmr Ibn ᶜAyyāsh (d. 67/686) asked both al-Ḥusayn and Ibn al-Zubayr to return to Medina and enter in whatever the people had agreed upon.[64] Ibn Saᶜd, who usually does not comment on his reports, in this case gives his own opinion. He concurs with Ibn ᶜUmar's opinion that whatever the people (*al-jamāᶜa*) agree upon is better than rebellion, even if they recognize that Yazīd lacks the qualifications for the caliphate and, therefore, has no entitlement to it. Ibn Saᶜd narrates that Ibn ᶜUmar is reported to have said that given that al-Ḥusayn witnessed the Kūfans' failure to support his father and his brother, he should not revolt against the caliph for the rest of his life and should enter in whatever the people

[64] Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 57.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

agreed upon. Ibn ᶜUmar clearly expressed his opinion by stating, "*al-jamāᶜa* is better than uprising."[65]

As mentioned earlier, Ibn ᶜUmar was one of the four prominent nobles of Medina who refused to acknowledge Yazīd's accession and opposed Muᶜāwiya's desire to nominate his son as his successor. However, Ibn ᶜUmar was a man of peace and worship, as described by Muᶜāwiya in his will to Yazīd. Therefore, when he was asked by Muᶜāwiya, and later by the governor of Medina to swear allegiance to Yazīd, he responded that he would recognize Yazīd's caliphate only when all the people had paid homage to him. By opposing al-Ḥusayn's decision to revolt and by recognizing Yazīd's caliphate eventhough while it was illegitimate, Ibn ᶜUmar, in fact, was trying to avoid turmoil and bloodshed within the community.

Moreover, Ibn Saᶜd depicts al-Ḥusayn as somebody looking out for his own interests by revolting against Yazīd. He reports that Ibn ᶜUmar advised al-Ḥusayn not to go to Kūfa, telling him that his grandfather had preferred the hereafter to this world, and stating, "You will not get this world."[66] Ibn Saᶜd is presenting Sunnī perspective when he reports that al-Ḥusayn was revolting against his Imām and that, consequently, he was killing himself. He narrates that Abū Saᶜīd al-Khudrī (d. 74/693), a companion of the Prophet, asked al-Ḥusayn to be God-fearing, not to revolt against his Imām, Yazīd, and to stay in his home.[67] In another account, Ibn Saᶜd narrates that Abū Wāqid al-Laythī (d. 73/692)) received the news of al-Ḥusayn's departure to Kūfa in grief and commented that he was killing himself.[68]

---

[65] Ibid.
[66] Ibid.
[67] Ibid.
[68] Ibid.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Full details of al-Ḥusayn's conversation with Ibn ᶜUmar and Ibn ᶜAbbās are provided by Ibn Aᶜtham, who, in this respect, presents Shīᶜī point of view. He reports that Ibn ᶜUmar and Ibn ᶜAbbās were already at Mecca when al-Ḥusayn left Medina and reached Mecca. Ibn ᶜUmar warned al-Ḥusayn about the animosity of the Umayyads and that he might be killed at the hands of Yazīd's supporters, and, therefore, asked him to pay homage to Yazīd in order to save his life. Al-Ḥusayn responded that he would neither pay homage to Yazīd nor make any compromise with him, reminding him that the Umayyad officials had expelled him from his residence and intended to murder him. Ibn ᶜAbbās agreed with al-Ḥusayn's statement and declared that whoever fought against al-Ḥusayn was, in fact, fighting the Prophet, and, moreover, expressed his readiness to fight with him. Ibn ᶜUmar disagreed with Ibn ᶜAbbās' position and asserted to al-Ḥusayn that if he stayed at home he would be safe from the Umayyads, even if he did not swear allegiance to Yazīd. Al-Ḥusayn dismissed Ibn ᶜUmar's assertion and insisted that the Umayyad authorities would not leave him alone until he had pledged allegiance to Yazīd or they had killed him. Al-Ḥusayn also asked Ibn ᶜUmar to support him.[69]

As for Ibn ᶜAbbās, Ibn Aᶜtham contradicts other sources when he reports that he expressed his readiness to support al-Ḥusayn's uprising against Yazīd. Ibn ᶜAbbās, as noted above, strongly disagreed with al-Ḥusayn's decision to comply with the Kūfans' call. As for Ibn ᶜUmar, according to al-Ḥusayn, his responsibility was to stand against the illegitimate caliph. Yazīd, as mentioned previously, was not unaware of the fact that his caliphate would not be legitimate unless it was recognized by the four sons of the Ṣaḥāba.

[69] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 26-9.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The questions that need to be answered at this juncture are as follows: Why did he refuse Ibn al-Zubayr's offer to stay in Mecca with all the people, including Ibn al-Zubayr himself, offering to swear allegiance to him and support him?[70] Why was al-Ḥusayn insistent on leaving Mecca and why did he his refuse to listen to all those who advised him to stay there? Why did he not pay heed to prominent nobles, such as Ibn ᶜUmar and Abū Saᶜīd al-Khudrī, when they advised him to stay in his home in Medina?

According to some accounts, al-Ḥusayn, because of his refusal to acknowledge Yazīd's caliphate, believed that he would be killed by the Umayyads if he remained in Mecca. Both Ibn Saᶜd and Ibn Aᶜtham narrate that when Ibn ᶜAbbās advised al-Ḥusayn to stay there, al-Ḥusayn refused to comply, explaining that he would prefer to be killed outside Mecca so as not to violate its sanctity.[71]

Moreover, al-Ḥusayn was confident that the Umayyad authorities would murder him wherever he lived if he insisted on refusing to recognize Yazīd's caliphate. Ibn Aᶜtham narrates that when Ibn Jaᶜfar told al-Ḥusayn not to rush in going to Kūfa, promising him that he would secure safe-conduct for him from the Banū Umayya, al-Ḥusayn responded that the Umayyad authorities would not leave him alone until he acknowledged Yazīd's caliphate or until they had killed him wherever he might be.[72]

Ibn Aᶜtham also reports that a man from Kūfa called Abū Hūdha al-Azdī met with al-Ḥusayn on the way to Kūfa, in a place called al-Thaᶜlabiyya. Al-Azdī was astonished that al-Ḥusayn had left Mecca and Medina and was going to Kūfa. When al-Azdī asked why

[70] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 375. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 289.
[71] Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 61. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 73-4.
[72] Ibid., 3: 74.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

he had left the holy cities, al-Ḥusayn replied that the Umayyad officials were looking for him in order to kill him and that, eventually, they would achieve their goal.[73]

Al-Ḥusayn's conviction that the Umayyad officials had arranged to assassinate him in Mecca is supported by al-Ṭabarī and al-Balādhurī. They report that when Ibn al-Zubayr asked al-Ḥusayn to stay in Mecca--asserting that all the people including himself would swear allegiance to him--al-Ḥusayn declined his offer, explaining that he would prefer to be killed outside Mecca in order to protect its sanctity. [74] In another account, al-Ṭabarī narrates that al-Ḥusayn claimed that the Umayyad authorities would not leave him alone until they had killed him.[75]

For this reason, he did not listen to the advice of his associates, including the Banū Hāshim, and decided to leave Mecca. However, it should be noted once again that those Banū Hāshim who advised him to stay in Mecca did not insist that he recognize Yazīd's caliphate or that he put his hand in Yazīd's; rather they recommended that he take refuge somewhere other than Kūfa.

Now the question is: Why did al-Ḥusayn not follow Ibn ᶜAbbās and Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya's advice to go to Yemen, where he would have found many supporters and would have been more safe from the Umayyad danger?

After the abdication of al-Ḥasan, as mentioned earlier, the people of Kūfa, on many occasions, requested al-Ḥusayn to fight against Muᶜāwiya. Al-Ḥusayn, however, refused, asking them to wait until after Muᶜāwiya's death. After Muᶜāwiya's demise, the people of Kūfa repeated their demand that he lead them in order to establish justice and remove the corruption caused by Yazīd. Then al-Ḥusayn agreed to comply with the Kūfans' call and

[73] Ibid., 79.
[74] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 289. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 375.
[75] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 296.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to protest against the legitimacy of Yazīd's caliphate. Since al-Ḥusayn had received a confirmation from his cousin Ibn ᶜAqīl that, before Ibn Ziyād's arrival, the people of Kūfa had rejected Yazīd's caliphate and expressed their readiness to support him, al-Ḥusayn believed that he was obliged to go there.

Al-Balādhurī tells us, on the authority of al-Shaᶜbī, that when Ibn ᶜUmar advised al-Ḥusayn not to go to Iraq, he responded that he had received the Kūfans' letters and their allegiance to his cause and, therefore, it was his duty to comply.[76] For this reason, al-Ḥusayn refused to listen to those who advised him not to go to Kūfa, even if his decision ended in dangerous consequences. The horrible consequence of al-Ḥusayn's killing at the hands of the Umayyad officials was also expected by ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn Muṭīᶜ (d. 74/693), who is reported to have told al-Ḥusayn that, if he remained in Ḥijāz, all the people would swear allegiance to him, but, if he decided to go to Kūfa, he would be killed by the Umayyads and that all the people would become slaves after his death. However, al-Ḥusayn refused to listen to Ibn Muṭīᶜ's advice and decided to continue his journey to Kūfa.[77]

Even ᶜAmr Ibn Saᶜīd, the governor of Mecca, according to some sources, tried to prevent al-Ḥusayn from leaving Mecca, demanding that he should not answer the Kūfans' call. Ibn Saᶜīd predicted that, because of his sedition, al-Ḥusayn would be killed. He also confirmed to al-Ḥusayn that he would be safe from any harassment if he stayed in Mecca. Al-Ḥusayn declared that he was not seeking treason, but rather, that his departure from

---

[76] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 375.
[77] Ibid. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 261. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 24. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, pp. 228-9.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Mecca was for the sake of God and for practicing good deeds. He also rejected Ibn Sa^{c}īd's assertion that he would be safe in Mecca.[78]

According to this account, ^{c}Amr Ibn Sa^{c}īd used a gentle approach with al-Ḥusayn to prevent him form going to Kūfa, although he believed that al-Ḥusayn was going to make a mutiny among the community and that, consequently, he would be killed because of his sedition. Furthermore, Ibn Sa^{c}īd confirmed to al-Ḥusayn that he would be safe if he remained in Mecca. Many questions may arise in this respect: Would Ibn Sa^{c}īd have been satisfied with al-Ḥusayn's residing in Mecca without paying homage to Yazīd? Could he have opposed Yazīd's instruction that al-Ḥusayn should pay homage to him without any compromise? Did Ibn Sa^{c}īd intend to prevent al-Ḥusayn from reaching Kūfa by telling him that he would be safe with him? As mentioned earlier, al-Ḥusayn had left his residence in Medina because the governor of Medina had tried to force him to pay homage to Yazīd, according to Yazīd's instruction. In fact, Ibn Sa^{c}īd would not have been satisfied with al-Ḥusayn's remaining in Mecca unless he had sworn allegiance to Yazīd. Otherwise, Ibn Sa^{c}īd would have brought upon himself the wrath of the caliph and, consequently, would have lost his office, as had happened to the governor of Medina.

However, a different account of this event is narrated by al-Ṭabarī and al-Balādhurī. They report that when al-Ḥusayn was leaving Mecca, the governor's men tried to prevent him from continuing his journey, asking him to stay in Mecca. When al-Ḥusayn refused to stop his journey to Kūfa, a small fight took place between the governor's men and al-

[78] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 291-2. Ibn Sa^{c}d, *Maqtal*, p. 59. Ibn A^{c}tham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 75. In his narration, on the authority of Abū Mikhnaf, al-Ṭabarī states that ^{c}Amr Ibn Sa^{c}īd wrote to al-Ḥusayn upon the request of Ibn Ja^{c}far.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Ḥusayn's followers; they came to blows and hit one another with whips. Finally, al-Ḥusayn succeeded in leaving Mecca.[79]

According to this account, the intention of the governor of Mecca was to prevent al-Ḥusayn from reaching Kūfa and, perhaps, to put him under his control in order to force him to pay homage to Yazīd. Probably, because of the leading position of al-Ḥusayn among the people and his close relationship to the Prophet, the governor of Mecca, like some other people mentioned above, realized that al-Ḥusayn's decision to go to Kūfa would bring about a confrontation with the Umayyad authorities, leading to al-Ḥusayn's murder. And, his murder would have dreadful consequences not only for the community, but for the Umayyad officials as well. For this reason, the governor of Mecca tried his utmost to prevent this outcome.

Perhaps for the same reason, Marwān, if we accept Ibn Sa^{c}d's account, warned Ibn Ziyād against committing any harm to al-Ḥusayn. Ibn Sa^{c}d reports that when al-Ḥusayn departed from Mecca, Marwān Ibn al-Ḥakam wrote to Ibn Ziyād, informing him that al-Ḥusayn was heading to him: "He is the son of Fāṭima and Fāṭima was the daughter of the Prophet;" warning him against doing mischief to al-Ḥusayn, as such actions would not be forgotten by the masses.[80] Ibn A^{c}tham also reports that the governor of Medina, al-Walīd, wrote a letter to Ibn Ziyād, warning him against harming al-Ḥusayn.[81] Mu^{c}āwiya himself, in fact, was not unaware of the dreadful potential effect of al-Ḥusayn's killing. As mentioned previously, Mu^{c}āwiya, in his will, warned Yazīd against committing any harm to al-Ḥusayn in the event the people of Kūfa called him to rise against him.

---

[79] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 289. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 375.
[80] Ibn Sa^{c}d, *Maqtal*, p. 62.
[81] Ibn A^{c}tham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 78.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

During his journey from Mecca to Kūfa, al-Ḥusayn passed by many places and met with many people. One was al-Farazdaq, the famous poet, who was coming from Kūfa to Mecca for pilgrimage. Al-Farazdaq was astonished that al-Ḥusayn was leaving Mecca during the time of pilgrimage. When he asked him about the reason for his departure, al-Ḥusayn responded that he would be killed if he remained in Mecca and performed the pilgrimage. However, al-Ḥusayn wanted to investigate the situation of the Kūfans to see if they were still loyal to him. When al-Ḥusayn asked about the Kūfans, al-Farazdaq responded, "Their hearts are with you, but their swords are with the Banū Umayyad," and al-Ḥusayn did not deny this statement.[82]

The questions that present themselves here are: Why did al-Ḥusayn decide to continue his journey, although he was informed, through al-Farazdaq's statement, that the Kūfans had no determination to support him and fight for him,? Why did he not change his plan and go to Yemen, where he would have found more supporters? Before making his decision, al-Ḥusayn perhaps wanted to be more confident about the Kūfans' attitude.

When al-Ḥusayn passed by a place called al-Tanᶜīm, he encountered a caravan coming from Yemen loaded with jewelry and other goods. The caravan had been sent to Yazīd by his governor in Yemen, Baḥīr Ibn Raysān. Al-Ḥusayn seized the goods in the caravan and distributed them amongst his followers. He also gave those who were in charge of the caravan the option of joining him in his journey to Kūfa or of leaving him, after he had given them their fees.[83] Why did al-Ḥusayn seize the property of the caravan which did not belong to him? Did he need to distribute it among his men in order to

[82] Al-Ṭabarī, on the authority of ᶜAwāna, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 290. An account similar to al-Ṭabarī's is narrated by Ibn Saᶜd with a different chain of authorities. *Maqtal*, p. 63. Al-Farazdaq's meeting with al-Ḥusayn is also narrated by Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 80, al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 245 and al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 376-7, but they do not mention al-Ḥusayn's reply that he would be killed if he did not leave Mecca.
[83] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 375-6. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 289-90. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 245.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

strengthen his cause? Perhaps he believed that this property did not belong to Yazīd, since he was not a legitimate caliph and had, therefore, no right to take it.

While al-Ḥusayn was heading towards Iraq, Ibn Ziyād, after killing Ibn ᶜAqīl and Hānī, brought Kūfa under full control. He blocked all the roads leading from the Ḥijāz to Kūfa and gave strict orders forbidding anyone from entering or leaving the territory of Kūfa. He sent al-Ḥuṣayn Ibn al-Numayr, the commander of the bodyguard (*shurṭa*), to al-Qādisiyya, the normal route that links Kūfa with the Ḥijāz. Similarly, other areas which linked Kūfa to Baṣra and other parts of Iraq were heavily patrolled by the Umayyad cavalry.[84]

Unaware of Ibn ᶜAqīl's fate, al-Ḥusayn, when he reached a place called al-Ḥājir, dispatched Qays Ibn Mushir al-Ṣaydāwī with a letter to the Kūfans, informing them of his coming. In his letter, al-Ḥusayn said, "Ibn ᶜAqīl's letter came to me, informing me of your sound judgment and the agreement of your leaders to support us and to seek our rights," and he told them that he had left Mecca. Al-Ḥusayn also instructed them to be united and watchful in their affairs, because he was coming to them within the next few days. Qays went towards Kūfa and when he reached al-Qādisiyya, Ibn Numayr apprehended him and sent him to Ibn Ziyād. Realizing that he was al-Ḥusayn's messenger to the Kūfans, Ibn Ziyād ordered Qays to curse al-Ḥusayn on the pulpit. Contrary to Ibn Ziyād's order, Qays praised al-Ḥusayn and told the Kūfans of his coming. He also urged them to be ready for al-Ḥusayn's arrival and to support him. However, Ibn Ziyād ordered him to be thrown from the roof of the palace, and he was killed.[85]

---

[84] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 263. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 297. 3: 378. Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 68.
[85] Ibid. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 297-8. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 378.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Different contents of al-Ḥusayn's letter to the Kūfans are narrated by Ibn Aʿtham. In his letter, al-Ḥusayn, according to Ibn Aʿtham, stated that one of the religious duties of any Muslim is to rise up against an oppressive ruler who changes God's norms, opposes the Sunna of the Prophet and rules the people with injustice and aggression. He also reminded them that they had pledged allegiance to him and had expressed their readiness to support him, and asked them to keep their allegiances and promises. Qays tore up the letter before he was detained by Ibn Ziyād's men. When Ibn Ziyād asked him about the names stipulated in this letter, Qays refused to tell him and, finally, was thrown from the top of the palace.[86]

Al-Ḥusayn, according to Ibn Aʿtham's account, confirmed that it was not only his responsibility to revolt against the illegitimate Umayyad authorities, but the duty of all Muslims to rise against them and fight for his cause.

According to al-Ṭabarī and al-Balādhurī, al-Ḥusayn dispatched ʿAbd Allāh Ibn Yaqṭur, his step-brother, with a letter to Ibn ʿAqīl, without knowing that the latter had already been killed. The cavalry of Ibn Numayr met him at al-Qādisiyya and sent him to Ibn Ziyād. Ibn Ziyād ordered him to be thrown from the roof of the palace when Ibn Yaqṭur refused to curse al-Ḥusayn. Before his death, he asked the Kūfans to support al-Ḥusayn against Ibn Ziyād, "the son of Marjāna, the grandson of Sumayya, a man who claims a false grandfather."[87]

According to Ibn Saʿd, al-Ḥusayn dispatched Ibn Yaqṭur to Kūfa while he was in Mecca and Ibn Ziyād executed Ibn Yaqṭur the very day he arrived in Kūfa.[88]

---

[86] Ibn Aʿtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 81-82.
[87] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 300. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 379.
[88] Ibn Saʿd, *Maqtal*, p. 65.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

On the other hand, Ibn A^{c}tham mentions the name "Ibn Yaqṭīn" instead of "Ibn Yaqṭur," and reports that he was apprehended by Ibn Numayr, the leader of Ibn Ziyād's forces, while Ibn Yaqṭur was leaving Kūfa. Ibn Numayr found a letter with him addressed to al-Ḥusayn from Ibn ^{c}Aqīl, telling al-Ḥusayn that more than twenty thousand of the Kūfans had pledged their allegiance to him and urging him to come in haste.[89]

From al-Ḥusayn's letters to the Kūfans, it is obvious that he was aware of their changeable character, since they had disappointed his father and his brother, and he wanted to be sure that they were still loyal to him and ready to support him, so that he could rely on them.

Al-Ḥusayn not only sought to have as many supporters as he could in order to strengthen his position for the expected confrontation with the Umayyads, but also wanted to explain to everyone he met in his journey to Kūfa the reason for his uprising and demand that they fulfill their duty by supporting him against the oppressive authorities. Therefore, whenever al-Ḥusayn met with a group of people or an individual during his journey, he invited them to join him.

Al-Ṭabarī and al-Dīnawarī report that al-Ḥusayn met Ibn Muṭī^{c} for the second time when he reached one of the watering places of the Arabs. When Ibn Muṭī^{c} asked why al-Ḥusayn had come to such a place, he explained that the Kūfans had written to him urging him to lead them against the Umayyads and that it was his obligation to answer their call. Aware of the ruthless treatment of the Umayyads toward their opponents, Ibn Muṭī^{c} feared that al-Ḥusayn would be killed. Ibn Muṭī^{c} expressed his anxiety that if they dared to kill al-Ḥusayn, they would never hesitate to kill anyone after him. Therefore, Ibn Muṭī^{c}

[89] Ibn A^{c}tham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 50-1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

continued, "It will be the sacredness of Islam that is violated, the sacredness of the Quraysh and the sacredness of the Arabs." He also requested that al-Ḥusayn not confront the Umayyad authorities, but al-Ḥusayn did not listen to his warning and decided to continue his journey.[90]

Zuhayr Ibn al-Qayn was traveling from Mecca along with his wife and followers and was taking the same route as al-Ḥusayn. He is reported to have been reluctant to travel alongside al-Ḥusayn and tried to avoid meeting him at every halting place. In a place called Zarūd, Zuhayr had no choice but to stop near al-Ḥusayn's camp. Al-Ḥusayn seized this opportunity and sent his messenger to Zuhayr, calling him for a meeting. Zuhayr was surprised and was reluctant to accept al-Ḥusayn's call, but his wife urged him to go and listen to the Prophet's grandson. Zuhayr went to al-Ḥusayn and it was not long before he returned and announced that he would join al-Ḥusayn. He explained to his companions that he was obligated to fight alongside the grandson of the Prophet and turned to them stating, "Whoever wants to follow me may do so, and otherwise, it is the end of our association."[91]

Although Zuhayr was reluctant to meet with al-Ḥusayn, when he finally met with him, he decided to join him and fight for him, and, later on, sacrificed himself for the sake of his cause. Most probably, al-Ḥusayn explained to Zuhayr the reason for his revolt against the Umayyads and Zuhayr's duty to join him.

When al-Ḥusayn reached Qaṣr Banī Muqātil, ᶜUbayd Allāh Ibn al-Ḥurr al-Juᶜfī (d.73/692), a brave and prominent person from Kūfa, was already there. When al-Juᶜfī heard of al-Ḥusayn's coming to Kūfa, he left it in order not to be involved in the

[90] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 298. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, pp. 246
[91] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 298-9. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 378-9. Al-Balādhurī states that Zuhayr was an ᶜUthmānid.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

expecting fighting. Although al-Juᶜfī admitted al-Ḥusayn's merits and his relationship to the Prophet, he was reluctant to be killed with him and, therefore, tried to avoid meeting him. When al-Ḥusayn asked al-Juᶜfī to join him, al-Juᶜfī replied that he did not want to fight. Then al-Ḥusayn warned him not to fight against the family of the Prophet, affirming, "By God! Anyone who hears our cry and does not help us, he will not be spared from God's wrath," and al-Juᶜfī confirmed that he would never fight against the family of the Prophet. [92]

Al-Ṭabarī and al-Balādhurī narrate that whenever al-Ḥusayn passed by a watering place, the people followed him.[93] Among those who joined him after they had finished their pilgrimage were ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn Sulaym and al-Madharī Ibn Mashmal. They are reported as saying that when they approached al-Ḥusayn's camp at Zarūd, they noticed a man coming from Kūfa. When the man recognized al-Ḥusayn's camp from a distance, he avoided meeting al-Ḥusayn and changed his route. Noticing this, al-Ḥusayn wanted to talk to the man in order to investigate the situation in Kūfa and asked the two newcomers to follow him and make inquiries. He told them that Ibn ᶜAqīl and Hānī had been killed and dragged by their legs into the market place. When they told al-Ḥusayn about the fate of Ibn ᶜAqīl and Hānī, they exhorted him not to go to Kūfa because there were no more supporters for him. At this point, al-Ḥusayn summoned Ibn ᶜAqīl's brothers, informing them of his death, and asked their opinion. They all declared that they would not go back until they had taken vengeance for their brothers or faced the same fate. Therefore, al-Ḥusayn decided to continue his journey.[94]

---

[92] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 307-8. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 384. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, pp. 250-1. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 83-4. It should be noted that Ibn Aᶜtham's narration contains many unimportant additions.
[93] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 300. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 379.
[94] Ibid. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 299-300. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 247. Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 3: 60.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Ibn Sa^{c}d narrates that when the news of the deaths of Ibn ^{c}Aqīl and Hānī reached al-Ḥusayn, his son, ^{c}Alī al-Akbar, asked him to abandon his decision and go back to Medina. He mentioned the disloyalty and treachery of the Kūfans and argued that there would be no more support for al-Ḥusayn in Kūfa. Ibn ^{c}Aqīl's brothers disagreed with him and decided to go to Kūfa and fight their enemies, urging al-Ḥusayn to continue his journey. Hearing this, al-Ḥusayn turned to his followers and asked for their opinions. All agreed that the Kūfans would disappoint him. Al-Ḥusayn, however, did not listen to his son's and his followers' opinions and decided to continue his journey. But he permitted whoever wanted to, to withdraw from him. Ibn Sa^{c}d states that most of those who had joined al-Ḥusayn during his journey withdrew.[95] In his account, which is not supported by other sources, Ibn Sa^{c}d wants to tell us that al-Ḥusayn's decision to continue his journy to Kūfa was even opposed by his son and his followers.[96]

Al-Ḥusayn, according to al-Ṭabarī and al-Balādhurī, waited until the news of the death of his step-brother, Ibn Yaqṭur, came to him in a place called Zubāla. There al-Ḥusayn read a written statement to his followers. He informed them about the deaths of Ibn ^{c}Aqīl, Hānī and Ibn Yaqṭur, and said, "Our Shī^{c}a have deserted us. Those of you who would prefer to leave us, may leave freely without guilt." The people started to disperse until there were left with him only those followers who had come with him from Medina."[97]

According to the above-mentioned accounts, al-Ḥusayn was not quite sure about his journey to Kūfa when he had received news of the killing of Ibn ^{c}Aqīl and Hānī. He decided to go to Kūfa only to avenge Ibn ^{c}Aqīl's death, although he was acquainted with

[95] Ibn Sa^{c}d, *Maqtal*, pp. 67-8.
[96] Ibid.
[97] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 300-1. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 379-80. See also, al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 247.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the fact that the Kūfans would fail him in his battle against the Umayyads. Moreover, al-Ḥusayn, according to Ibn Sa^{c}d's account, asked his followers to withdraw from him despite the fact that he was more in need of their support at this time. The most important questions in this juncture are: Why did al-Ḥusayn decide to go on to Kūfa eventhough he had received news of Ibn ^{c}Aqīl's death and had become more confident that the Kūfans would fail to support him in his fight? Was he really satisfied with the opinion of Ibn ^{c}Aqīl's brothers to seek revenge for Ibn ^{c}Aqīl's killing and to die like him?

Al-Ṭabarī states that al-Ḥusayn permitted his followers to withdraw from him because he realized that most of the Arabs followed him only because they thought that there would be no fight; they believed that al-Ḥusayn was going to a subdued land where the obedience of its inhabitants to him had already been assured. Additionally, al-Ṭabarī asserts that, al-Ḥusayn wanted in his company only those persons who were fully aware of the danger they were facing and who were prepared to share his fate and to die with him.[98] According to al-Ṭabarī's statement, al-Ḥusayn was not unaware that he and his followers were going to face death, and, therefore, he wanted them to be conscious of their fate. Al-Ṭabarī asserts that al-Ḥusayn was fully aware of the unreliable character of the Kūfans and that he would face death if he complied with their call and went to Kūfa. He narrates that, when he learned about al-Ḥusayn's intention to continue his journey, Lūdhān, who met with al-Ḥusayn on his way to Kūfa, advised him not to approach the city. Lūdhān told al-Ḥusayn that he would not come to anything but the points of spears and the edges of swords. He opined, "If those who sent for you were enough to support you in battle and had prepared the ground for you, and you had then come to them, that

[98] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 301.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

would have been a wise decision. However, in light of the new situation, I do not think that you ought to do it." Al-Ḥusayn confirmed to him that the wise decision was not hidden from him, commenting, "The command of God cannot be resisted."[99]

According to al-Ḥusayn's statements, he believed that the Umayyad authorities would not leave him alone until he had either submitted to Yazīd or been killed. And, al-Ḥusayn's obligation was not to recognize the illegitimate caliph, but rather to fight against him. Therefore, al-Ḥusayn perhaps preferred to be killed in fighting the Umayyad authorities even without supporters.

As noted earlier, Ibn Ziyād sent Ibn Numayr al-Tamīmī, who was in charge of his police, to take up position at al-Qādisiyya, place lookouts and control the area from al-Qādisiyya to Kūfa. Al-Ḥurr Ibn Yazīd al-Tamīmī was sent in advance from al-Qādisiyya with one thousand mounted men to prevent al-Ḥusayn from entering Kūfa. Some of al-Ḥusayn's followers saw al-Ḥurr's cavalry vanguard from a distance, and when they told al-Ḥusayn, he asked them for a place of refuge in case there was a fight. Following the advice of his followers, al-Ḥusayn turned left toward Dhū Ḥusum, a well-fortified place near Karbalā'. When al-Ḥurr and his cavalry reached al-Ḥusayn, the latter ordered his attendants to provide the one thousand horsemen and their mounts with water to drink. However, al-Ḥurr positioned his forces opposite al-Ḥusayn's until the time for the midday prayer drew near. Al-Ḥusayn seized this opportunity to explain to the people the reason for his coming and addressed them:

> I did not come to you until your letters were brought to me by your messengers, informing me that you had no Imām and urging me to come so that, through me, God might unite you under guidance and truth. Since this was your view, I have come to you. Therefore, if you give me what

[99] Ibid.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> you guaranteed in your covenants and sworn testimonies, I will come to your town. If you will not and are reluctant about my coming, I will leave you and go back to the place from which I came.

Nobody answered al-Ḥusayn and they remained silent before him, and al-Ḥurr and his horsemen joined al-Ḥusayn in his prayer.[100]

According to al-Ṭabarī, on the authority of Hishām al-Kalbī, after finishing the prayer, al-Ḥusayn reminded the people of his relationship to the Prophet and again wanted to clarify to them the reason for his coming, but this time he wanted to know their response. He turned his face to al-Ḥurr's men and said:

> We are the family (*ahl al-bayt*) of Muḥammad and as such are more entitled to the authority (*wilāyah*) of this government (*amr*) over you than these pretenders who claim what does not belong to them. They have brought tyranny and aggression among you. If you dislike us, or do not know our rights, and if your view has now changed from what came to us in your letters and what your messengers brought, then I will leave you.[101]

In his statement, al-Ḥusayn confirmed that, given his relationship to the Prophet, he was more entitled to the caliphate than Yazīd, who did not follow in the footsteps of the Prophet and who had no entitlement to the caliphate. He asserted that Yazīd's caliphate was illegitimate and that the Umayyad authorities brought injustice to the community. Al-Ḥusayn once again informed al-Ḥurr and his men that he had gone to Kūfa only when he received the letters and messengers of the Kūfans, inviting him to be their leader and lead them against the Umayyads.

---

[100] Ibid., 4: 303. Al-Ṭabarī, The Caliphate of Yazīd b. Muᶜāwiya, *The History of al-Ṭabarī* (*Ta'rikh al-Rusul wal-Mulūk*). XIX. Translated and annotated by I.K. Howard, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990, p. 93. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 85-8. Al-Balādhurī, 3: 380. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, pp. 248-50. Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 68. In his very brief narration, Ibn Saᶜd states that al-Ḥuṣayn Ibn Tamīm sent al-Ḥurr with one thousand men to prevent al-Ḥusayn from reaching Kūfa and to aggravate him.

[101] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 303. Al-Ṭabarī, The Caliphate of Yazīd b. Muᶜāwiya, *The History of al-Ṭabarī* (*Ta'rikh al-Rusul wal-Mulūk*). XIX, p. 94. See also Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 88.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

However, al-Ḥurr responded that he had no idea about the letters and messages of the Kūfans. Al-Ḥusayn asked ᶜUqba Ibn Simᶜān, his wife's *mawlā*, to bring out the two saddlebags in which the letters were kept, and scattered them in front of al-Ḥurr. Al-Ḥurr confirmed that he was not among those who wrote to al-Ḥusayn and told him that he had been ordered by Ibn Ziyād to prevent him from entering Kūfa and to take him to Ibn Ziyād. Al-Ḥusayn strongly refused to submit to al-Ḥurr, stating, "Death is nearer than what you are demanding," and ordered his followers to rise and depart. When they set off, al-Ḥurr's men stopped them. Al-Ḥusayn insisted that he would not follow him and al-Ḥurr also affirmed that he would not let al-Ḥusayn go anywhere else. When their conversation got more intense and fighting between the two sides was about to commence, al-Ḥurr tried to avoid confrontation with al-Ḥusayn and to reach a compromise. He told him that he was not ordered to fight against him, but rather to take him to Ibn Ziyād. Al-Ḥusayn accepted al-Ḥurr's suggestion that he should not take any road that would either bring him into Kūfa or take him back to Medina until al-Ḥurr received new orders from Ibn Ziyād.[102]

Al-Ḥusayn, therefore, set off with his followers with al-Ḥurr's men marching by him. In one of the halting places, al-Ḥusayn seized the opportunity provided to describe the real character of the Umayyad rule, its tyranny and its violation of Islamic codes. He also declared that the religious duty of any Muslim is to rise up against an oppressive ruler who changes God's norms, opposes the Sunna of the Prophet and rules the people by injustice and aggression. Al-Ḥusayn referred to the Prophet's statement:

---

[102] Ibid., 3: 89. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 303-4. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 380-1. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, pp. 249-50.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> When anyone sees a tyrannical ruler making permissible what God has forbidden, violating God's covenant, and opposing the Sunna of the Apostle of God by acting against the servants of God sinfully and with hostility, when anyone sees all these incidents and does not reproach him by deed or by word, it is God's decree to make that person subject to the same fate as that ruler.[103]

Since the Umayyad rulers, according to al-Ḥusayn, were an obvious example of an oppressive authority and since he was from the family of the Prophet, al-Ḥusayn believed that he was more responsible than any other Muslim for changing this situation:

> Indeed, these authorities [the Umayyads] have adhered to obedience to Satan and have abandoned the Merciful; they have made corruption visible; they neglect the punishment (*ḥudūd*) laid down by God; they have seized the booty (*fay'*) exclusively for themselves; they have permitted what God has forbidden, and they have forbidden what He has permitted. I am more responsible for changing this than anyone else.[104]

Al-Ḥusayn, according to al-Ṭabarī and Ibn Aʿtham, again reminded the assembly of their letters and their promises to support him, asking them to fulfill their pledges of allegiance to him. He affirmed that he would lead them to the right path if they fulfilled their promises and did not break their allegiance. He said:

> Your letters were brought to me, and your messengers came to me with your oath of allegiance that you would not hand me over or desert me. If you fulfill your promises, you will arrive at the right path, for I am al-Ḥusayn Ibn ʿAlī, the son of Fāṭima, the daughter of the Prophet. My life is with your lives; my family is with your families. In me, you have a perfect example (*uswa*). However, if you break your covenant and rebuke the oath

---

[103] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 304. Al-Ṭabarī, The Caliphate of Yazīd b. Muʿāwiya, *The History of al-Ṭabarī (Ta'rikh al-Rusul wal-Mulūk)*. XIX, p. 95.

[104] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 304-5. Al-Ṭabarī, The Caliphate of Yazīd b. Muʿāwiya, *The History of al-Ṭabarī (Ta'rikh al-Rusul wal-Mulūk)*. XIX, pp. 95-96. Ibn Aʿtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 91. Ibn Aʿtham reports that al-Ḥusayn sent his statement to his supporters in Kūfa with his messenger Qays Ibn Mushir. Al-Balādhurī mentions this statement briefly. *Ansāb*, 3: 381

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> of allegiance that you have given, it is not a thing that is unknown of you. You have done it to my father, my brother and my cousin.[105]

Since al-Ḥusayn received no answer from al-Ḥurr's men, he realized that he would not be able to expect support from the Kūfans. He decided to reach no compromise with the Umayyad authorities and that battle would be the upshot of his journey. Al-Ḥusayn, therefore, turning to his remaining followers, declared his determination to fight and explained to them the duty of the believer. He said that he could not live with the illegitimate caliphate without enjoining good and forbidding evil, and that he preferred to die than to live under tyrannical authorities (the Umayyads). He affirmed that this was the duty of any believer. Al-Ṭabarī reports, on the authority of ᶜUqba, that al-Ḥusayn addressed his followers:

> You see what this matter has come to. In deed, the world has changed, and it has changed for the worse... Can you not see that truth (*al-ḥaqq*) is no longer something that men practice and falsehood (*al-bāṭil*) is no longer desisted from, so that the believer rightly desires to meet God. I can only regard death but martyrdom and life with these oppressors as a tribulation. (*la arā al-mawt illā shahāda wal-ḥayāt maᶜa al-ẓālimīn illā baramā*).[106]

Al-Ḥurr and his men traveled on one side while al-Ḥusayn and his followers traveled on the other, until they reached a place called ᶜUdhayb al-Hijānāt. A group of four persons were coming from Kūfa in order to join al-Ḥusayn. When they tried to approach al-Ḥusayn's camp, al-Ḥurr attempted to prevent them, claiming that they were not among the party who came with al-Ḥusayn and that, therefore, they had no right to join him. Al-Ḥusayn declared that they were his supporters and helpers and that he would defend them in the same way as he would defend his own life. Al-Ḥurr insisted

---

[105] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 305. Al-Ṭabarī, The Caliphate of Yazīd b. Muᶜāwiya, *The History of al-Ṭabarī (Ta'rikh al-Rusul wal-Mulūk)*. XIX, p. 96. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 91.

[106] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 305. Al-Ṭabarī, The Caliphate of Yazīd b. Muᶜāwiya, *The History of al-Ṭabarī (Ta'rikh al-Rusul wal-Mulūk)*. XIX, p. 96.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

on detaining them or sending them back, but al-Ḥusayn asked him to carry out the agreement between them or he would fight against al-Ḥurr. When al-Ḥurr realized al-Ḥusayn's seriousness, he backed down.[107]

It is very clear that al-Ḥurr tried to avoid confrontation with al-Ḥusayn. Al-Ḥurr, who had one thousand fighters with him, could easily have defeated al-Ḥusayn and his followers, and that would have pleased his leader Ibn Ziyād, who wanted to get rid of al-Ḥusayn as soon as possible. Al-Ḥurr, however, declined to do that. Why did al-Ḥurr avoid fighting against al-Ḥusayn? Was it because he was not instructed to fight him? Or because he knew of al-Ḥusayn's position among his people and of his relationship to the Prophet and, therefore, did not want to be involved in his killing? Al-Ḥurr, in fact, was not unaware of al-Ḥusayn's position and of his close relationship to the Prophet and, for this reason, he performed his prayers behind him, as mentioned earlier. Moreover, when al-Ḥurr, as we will see later, saw that the intention of the Umayyad officials was to fight against al-Ḥusayn, he decided to join al-Ḥusayn's camp and finally died for his sake.

Still concerned about the situation in Kūfa, al-Ḥusayn asked the group who joined him for the news. They informed him that the tribal leaders had been bribed and that their coffers had been filled so that their support for Ibn Ziyād was won. As for the rest of the people, "Their hearts are inclined toward you, but soon their swords will be drawn against you."[108]

Al-Ḥusayn had a unique opportunity to protect himself from the threats of the Umayyad officials, but he preferred to keep his agreement with al-Ḥurr. When al-

---

[107] Ibid., 4: 305-6. Al-Baldhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 382.
[108] Ibid. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 306.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Ṭirimmāḥ Ibn ᶜAdī, the guide of the four persons who had joined al-Ḥusayn's camp, noticed the small number of al-Ḥusayn's followers compared to the one thousand troops of al-Ḥurr, he told al-Ḥusayn that he would be defeated even if he confronted al-Ḥurr's men only. Al-Ṭirimmāḥ informed al-Ḥusayn that, before his departure from Kūfa, he had seen a great number of people that had been recruited to station themselves at the outskirts of Kūfa and were ready to march against him. Therefore, al-Ṭirimmāḥ appealed to al-Ḥusayn not to move towards Kūfa and advised him to settle in a land where he could find protection. He invited al-Ḥusayn to come to al-Ṭirimmāḥ's tribe and to settle in their unassailable mountains, promising him that he could call as many as twenty thousand men to fight with him. Al-Ḥusayn replied that he had an agreement with al-Ḥurr and that he could not break this agreement and that, therefore, he could not accept al-Ṭirimmāḥ's suggestion.[109]

Al-Ḥurr, who was waiting for new instructions from Ibn Ziyād, continued to accompany al-Ḥusayn and his followers until they reached the village of Nīnawā. Suddenly, there appeared a rider on a fast mount coming from Kūfa who handed al-Ḥurr a letter from Ibn Ziyād. In this letter, Ibn Ziyād ordered al-Ḥurr to force al-Ḥusayn to stop in an open place without protection or water. Al-Ḥurr decided to obey. Fearing Ibn Ziyād's messenger, al-Ḥurr rejected the request of al-Ḥusayn's followers to let them stop at Nīnawā or any other village. Finally, al-Ḥusayn and his followers settled at Karbalā' on the second of Muḥarram in the year 61 (October, 2nd, 680).[110] Thinking that the situation would get worse and that more troops would come from Kūfa to fight

[109] Ibid., 4: 306-7. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 383.
[110] Ibid., 3: 384-5. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 308-9. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 91. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, pp. 252-3.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

against them, Zuhayr Ibn al-Qayn suggested that al-Ḥusayn fight al-Ḥurr and his men. Al-Ḥusayn declined to begin the fighting.[111]

[111] Ibid. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 309. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 385. Ibn Aʿtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 92.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

III. Part Three: The Murder of al-Ḥusayn

When Ibn Ziyād heard that al-Ḥurr had carried out his instructions and detained al-Ḥusayn, he started to recruit as many troops as he could to fight against al-Ḥusayn. For this difficult mission, he decided to nominate ᶜUmar Ibn Saᶜd as the leader of his troops. Why did Ibn al-Ziyād chose him instead of al-Ḥuṣayn Ibn al-Numayr, then the commander of his troops, since Ibn Ziyād had already witnessed the latter's loyalty to the Umayyad authorities? Perhaps Ibn Ziyād wanted to send somebody that the Kūfans were familiar with. He probably assigned ᶜUmar Ibn Saᶜd because of the reputation of his father, Saᶜd Ibn Abī Waqqās, who was one of the prominent Companions of the Prophet and was the first to reside in Kūfa.[112] Therefore, he thought perhaps that ᶜUmar would be able to deal with the Kūfans without much difficulty. Perhaps Ibn Ziyād was looking for somebody who knew al-Ḥusayn's position and would be able to negotiate with him and accordingly he chose ᶜUmar for this hard task.

In fact, Ibn Ziyād had already commissioned ᶜUmar with four thousand men to fight the people of al-Daylam who came to overrun Dastabā, a large district between al-Rayy and Hamadhān in Iran. Ibn Ziyād also promised ᶜUmar in writing to appoint him as the governor of al-Rayy if he carried out this task. When the affair of al-Ḥusayn developed, Ibn Ziyād recalled ᶜUmar and ordered him to go at once to negotiate with al-Ḥusayn. Realizing that the two parties, al-Ḥusayn and Ibn Ziyād, would not reach a compromise and that fighting was inevitable, ᶜUmar tried to avoid taking part in shedding the blood of al-Ḥusayn and, therefore, requested that Ibn Ziyād relieve him of

[112] See for instance, Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 3: 447.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

this task. Ibn Ziyād initially accepted ᶜUmar's refusal but with the condition that ᶜUmar would no longer be nominated as governor of al-Rayy. Therefore, ᶜUmar asked Ibn Ziyād to give him time to make his decision, and the latter agreed.[113]

ᶜUmar consulted his family and close associates and they warned him against being involved in fighting against al-Ḥusayn. Among them was his nephew, Ḥamza Ibn al-Mughīra. He advised ᶜUmar to avoid confronting al-Ḥusayn, asserting that he would be committing a crime before God and breaking the bonds of his kinship with al-Ḥusayn. He also told ᶜUmar that even if he lost all of his wealth, property and his position it would be better for him than to meet God after having shed the blood of al-Ḥusayn.[114] Ibn Saᶜd relates that even ᶜUmar's tribe, the Banū Zuhra, warned him against involving himself in al-Ḥusayn's killing.[115]

ᶜUmar was not unaware of the dangerous consequences of al-Ḥusayn's killing and tried to avoid this crisis, but meanwhile, he was not ready to lose his promised office as governor of al-Rayy. Although ᶜUmar promised Ḥamza to follow his advice, he decided not to give up the governorship of al-Rayy. He asked Ibn Ziyād to relieve him of this task while keeping him in his office, but Ibn Ziyād insisted that ᶜUmar would keep his office only on the condition that he submited to his orders and fought against al-Ḥusayn. ᶜUmar preferred to keep his office and decided to command of Ibn Ziyād's troops.[116]

Here, however, Ibn Saᶜd contradicts other accounts; he narrates that only under Ibn Ziyād's threat did ᶜUmar accept to confront al-Ḥusayn. According to Ibn Saᶜd's

---

[113] Ibid., 4: 309. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 95. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 385. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 54.
[114] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 310. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 95-6. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 385-6.
[115] Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 69.
[116] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 386. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 310.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

account, Ibn Ziyād threatened to discharge ᶜUmar from his office, to destroy his house and to behead him if ᶜUmar refused to submit to his orders.[117]

Not only was ᶜUmar reluctant to fight against al-Ḥusayn, but so too was Shabath Ibn Ribᶜī, who was one of the prominent nobles of Kūfa and who played a significant role in Ibn ᶜAqīl's killing, as mentioned earlier. He pretended to be sick in order to avoid fighting al-Ḥusayn, but under Ibn Ziyād's insistence and threats he was placed in charge of some of Ibn Ziyād's troops.[118]

ᶜUmar's quandary demonstrates the dilemma which the people of Kūfa were facing. On the one hand, they understood very well al-Ḥusayn's prominent position among the people, based on his relationship to the Prophet, and, therefore, the enormous offense represented by his killing. On the other hand, they had lost their determination to resist Ibn Ziyād, who threatened severe punishment to whoever disobeyed his orders to assemble his troops against al-Ḥusayn.

In the meantime, Ibn Ziyād continued to recruit the people of Kūfa against al-Ḥusayn. He asked them to stay loyal to Yazīd, telling them that Yazīd had increased their stipend. He also ordered them to join ᶜUmar and threatened whoever failed to obey his order and declined to join his troops. Ibn Ziyād summoned some of the nobles of Kūfa and ordered them to roam the streets of Kūfa to discourage the people from supporting al-Ḥusayn, to persuade them to continue their submission to the caliph and to warn them against the hazardous consequences of disobedience.[119]

Ibn Ziyād's severe punishment for whoever disobeyed his orders and failed to join his troops is indicated further by al-Balādhurī, who reports that a man from Hamadhān

---

[117] Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, pp. 68-9.
[118] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 387. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 99. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 245
[119] Ibid. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 387. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 99.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

had come to Kūfa, looking for his bequest. One of the leaders of Ibn Ziyād's troops arrested him. Ibn Ziyād killed the man in order to make him an example for whoever remained in Kūfa and did not join his troops. Witnessing this, the people started to leave Kūfa rapidly.[120]

The people of Kūfa who remained were unwilling to be recruited against al-Ḥusayn and tried not to avoid involvement in this crisis. According to al-Balādhurī and al-Dīnawarī, many people sent out by Ibn Ziyād scattered before reaching Karbalā'.[121] Moreover, some people decided to desert ᶜUmar's camp and go to al-Ḥusayn's. Ibn Saᶜd reports that some people started to slip away from Kūfa to al-Ḥusayn's camp; including twenty men from ᶜUmar's camp.[122] ᶜAmmār Ibn Abī Salāma, according to al-Balādhurī, tried to put an end to this crisis; he tried to assassinate Ibn Ziyād at al-Nukhayla, but failed. However, ᶜAmmār managed to escape from Kūfa and joined al-Ḥusayn, later being killed with him.[123]

ᶜUmar's intention was to avoid confrontation with al-Ḥusayn and to reach a compromise with him.[124] He tried to identify al-Ḥusayn's intentions and to determine the reason for his coming. Many of ᶜUmar's leaders declined to comply with ᶜUmar's call to be messengers to al-Ḥusayn. They refused to meet with al-Ḥusayn because they were among those who had written to him and called him to lead them against the Umayyad authorities. Finally, Qurra Ibn Qays agreed to meet with al-Ḥusayn. When Qurra asked al-Ḥusayn about his intentions and the motive for his coming, al-Ḥusayn confirmed that the Kūfans had called him to come and urged him to lead them against

[120] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 387.
[121] Ibid. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 254.
[122] Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 69.
[123] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 388.
[124] Ibid.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the Umayyads. Al-Ḥusayn added, "If they have now come to dislike me, I will leave them."[125]

In his narration, al-Dīnawarī reports that al-Ḥusayn, in his reply to Qurra, asserted that the Kūfans had written to him and confirmed to him that eighteen thousand men had pledged allegiance to him. Since they had failed to keep their promises, al-Ḥusayn continued, he had decided to go back from where he had arrived but al-Ḥurr had prevented him from that.[126]

With al-Ḥusayn's response, ᶜUmar was very satisfied. He was in no doubt that al-Ḥusayn's intention was to avoid war and that ᶜUmar would reach a compromise with him, expecting that, with this reply, Ibn Ziyād would be satisfied too. However, ᶜUmar's expectation was incorrect. In fact, the Umayyad authorities, according to Yazīd's instructions, would not leave al-Ḥusayn alone unless he acknowledged Yazīd's caliphate, and this was unknown to ᶜUmar. Ibn Ziyād would not accept any compromise with al-Ḥusayn unless he swore allegiance to Yazīd. For this reason, Ibn Ziyād wrote to ᶜUmar, ordering him to ask al-Ḥusayn and his followers to submit to him and pay homage to Yazīd.[127] According to al-Dīnawarī, al-Ḥusayn confirmed that he would never pay homage to Yazīd, declaring that he would prefer death to swearing allegiance to Yazīd.[128]

Ibn Ziyād realized that al-Ḥusayn had decided to stand by his refusal to pay homage to Yazīd and, therefore, he tried to force him to change his decision and submit to him. According to some sources, Ibn Ziyād wrote another letter to ᶜUmar, ordering

---

[125] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 310-1. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 98.
[126] Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 254.
[127] Ibid. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4:311. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 386.
[128] Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 254.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

him to prevent al-Ḥusayn and his followers from drinking water. Following these instructions, ᶜUmar sent ᶜAmr Ibn al-Ḥajjāj with five hundred horsemen to take up positions along the river in order to prevent al-Ḥusayn and his followers from reaching the water .[129] Ibn Ziyād's endeavor to compel al-Ḥusayn to submit to him is emphasized by Ibn Aᶜtham's account. Ibn Aᶜtham narrates that a man from ᶜUmar's camp screamed at al-Ḥusayn, stating that Ibn Ziyād's men would not allow him to drink a drop of water unless he submitted to Yazīd's and Ibn Ziyād's orders.[130]

However, al-Husayn did not lose hope of reaching water. It is reported that when the thirst of al-Ḥusayn and his companions became severe, al-Ḥusayn sent his brother al-ᶜAbbās with thirty horsemen and twenty-foot soldiers with twenty water skins to get water at night. At their head with the standard was Nāfiᶜ Ibn Hilāl al-Jamalī. When ᶜAmr Ibn al-Ḥajjāj, who had been ordered to keep al-Ḥusayn from reaching the river, refused to permit them to get water, Nāfiᶜ ordered the foot soldiers to fill their water skins. A small battle between the two sides took place and, finally, al-Ḥusayn's followers succeeded in reaching the river and returned with full water skins.[131]

Having realized that no compromise could be reached between al-Ḥusayn and Ibn Ziyād, Ḥabīb Ibn Muẓāhir al-Asadī, a companion of the Prophet and one of al-Ḥusayn's supporters from the Banū Asad, endeavored to seek support from his tribe, who were settling near Karbalā'. He took permission from al-Ḥusayn to go and call them to join him. Seventy of them answered Ḥabīb's call and tried to join al-Ḥusayn. When ᶜUmar found out about them, he sent some horsemen under the commander of al-Azraq Ibn al-

[129] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 311-12. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 389. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 102.
[130] Ibid.
[131] Ibid. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 312. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 255.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Ḥārith and successfully prevented them from reaching al-Ḥusayn's camp after a fierce battle.[132]

At the request of al-Ḥusayn, a meeting was held between him and ᶜUmar at night between the two camps. ᶜUmar, who was reluctant to be involved in a battle against al-Ḥusayn, seized this opportunity and accepted the meeting hoping that they could reach a compromise. The questions here are: Did al-Ḥusayn intend to concede and to reach a compromise with ᶜUmar, even to the extent of paying homage to Yazīd? Or, did he insist on his goals and wish to persuade ᶜUmar to dissociate from Ibn Ziyād and join him?

In this respect, al-Ṭabarī provides three accounts on the authority of Abū Mikhnaf but with different eyewitnesses. The first account is narrated by Hānī Ibn Thubayt al-Ḥaḍramī, an eyewitness from ᶜUmar's camp. He reports that ᶜUmar came out with about twenty horsemen, as did al-Ḥusayn. When the two met, their men stayed away at such distance from them that they could not hear their voices. ᶜUmar and al-Ḥusayn talked together for a long time until a great part of the night had gone. The people made guesses about what had occurred between them. They speculated that al-Ḥusayn had asked ᶜUmar to leave the two camps and come with him to Yazīd. ᶜUmar did not accept this suggestion as he was afraid that his house would be destroyed or his estate would be seized as a consequence of following al-Ḥusayn. Although al-Ḥusayn promised him to rebuild his house and to give him better property than his current property, ᶜUmar was still unwilling to comply. The narrator, Hānī, says that this alleged suggestion of al-

[132] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 100-1. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 388.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Ḥusayn's started to spread among the people, even though none of them knew the actual content of the conversation.[133]

The second account is narrated by Mujālid Ibn Saᶜīd and al-Saqᶜab Ibn Zuhayr and some other narrators. They report that al-Ḥusayn proposed that ᶜUmar choose one of three options for him: 1) that they permit him to return to the place from which he had come, 2) that he put his hand in Yazīd's hand, or 3) that they send him to any one of the Muslim frontiers, where he could share the same rights and responsibilities of the inhabitants.[134]

The third version is narrated by ᶜUqba Ibn Simᶜān, a *mawlā* of al-Ḥusayn's wife who was with al-Ḥusayn's camp and who escaped from death . He is reported to have asserted that he has accompanied al-Ḥusayn at all times during his journey, from Medina to Mecca and from Mecca to Iraq, and that he had not left him until after his death. He also affirmed that he had heard all of al-Ḥusayn's speeches and conversations and that what was being circulated among the people about al-Ḥusayn's offer to ᶜUmar to go to Yazīd and put his hand in Yazīd's hand or be sent to a Muslim border area was baseless. Rather, ᶜUqba affirmed, al-Ḥusayn said, "Leave me, and I will travel this broad land so that we may see how the people's affairs develop."[135]

If al-Ḥusayn actually offered to put his hand in Yazīd, the question which arises is: Why did he decide to continue his journey to Kūfa, although he had received the news that there were no more supporters for him there and that those same supporters had

---

[133] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 312-3.
[134] Ibid., 4: 313. See also, al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, p. 114. It should be noted that al-Isfahānī's narration is identical to that of al-Ṭabarī, with some abbreviations. Similar to this account is also narrated by al-Balādhurī, who does not mention his authorities. *Ansāb*, 3: 390. According to another account, al-Balādhurī reports that al-Ḥusayn asked ᶜUmar only to permit him to go back to Medina. Ibid.
[135] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 313.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

been recruited to fight against him? He could easily have changed his path to go back to where he had come from or to any other place, as soon as he had received the news of Ibn ᶜAqīl's death and before he was detained and forced by al-Ḥurr to stop in Karbalā'. ᶜUmar, from the very beginning, was reluctant to march against al-Ḥusayn and be involved in al-Ḥusayn's killing and, therefore, tried to reach a compromise with him. Since nobody heard the authentic contents of the conversation between al-Ḥusayn and ᶜUmar, the latter perhaps put these words in al-Ḥusayn's mouth in his letter to Ibn Ziyād in order to persuade him to avoid fighting and to release himself from being involved in al-Ḥusayn's killing.

Ibn Aᶜtham, without providing a chain of authorities, does not mention al-Ḥusayn's proposals to ᶜUmar. He narrates that al-Ḥusayn tried to persuade ᶜUmar to dissociate himself from the Umayyad authorities and join him, but that he failed. ᶜUmar refused al-Ḥusayn's offer, fearing that his house would be destroyed and his estate would be seized by Ibn Ziyād if did not comply with his orders.[136] Ibn Aᶜtham, who used to provide Shīᶜī accounts, wants to tell us that al-Ḥusayn did not propose to put his hand in Yazīd's and that he was not ready to acknowledge Yazīd.

The same is the case of al-Yaᶜqubī's account. Although al-Ḥusayn's suggestions to ᶜUmar are not recorded by al-Yaᶜqūb, he reports that before the battle between the two sides took place, al-Ḥusayn reminded ᶜUmar's men of his rights as the Prophet's grandson. He also asked them to permit him to go back to his home, but they refused, telling him that either they were to take him to Ibn Ziyād or kill him.[137] On the other hand, Ibn Saᶜd, whose authorities are unknown, does not mention any meeting between

[136] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 101.
[137] Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 244.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

al-Ḥusayn and ᶜUmar. He reports that when al-Ḥusayn asked the assembly about the reason for their coming against him, they replied that they were afraid that their stipend (*ᶜaṭā'*) would be taken from them if they disobeyed Ibn Ziyād's orders. Al-Ḥusayn realized that the Kūfans' intention was to submit to Ibn Ziyād's orders and to fight against him so he tried to reach a compromise with them. At first, he asked them to permit him to go back to the place from which he had come, but they refused. Then, he asked them to allow him go to al-Rayy in order to fight against the Daylam, but they also rejected this suggestion. Finally, al-Ḥusayn requested that they let him go to Yazīd in order to put his hand in Yazīd's, but they rejected his appeal. They declared that they would refrain from fighting him only if he put his hand in Ibn Ziyād. This time al-Ḥusayn refused their demand.[138]

The question that presents itself here is: Why did the Kūfans refuse al-Ḥusayn's proposal to give *bayᶜa* to Yazīd? Yazīd's demand was only to secure al-Ḥusayn's acknowledgement of his caliphate and, therefore, he would have been very satisfied with al-Ḥusayn's suggestion. Besides, the Kūfans who had called al-Ḥusayn to come to Kūfa would not have been content in fighting him; in fact, they had been compelled by Ibn Ziyād to fight against al-Ḥusayn. Therefore, they should have been very satisfied with this suggestion. Did they receive any orders from Ibn Ziyād that al-Ḥusayn should put his hand in Ibn Ziyād's instead of Yazīd's? In fact, Ibn Saᶜd does mention this. Perhaps, Ibn Saᶜd who provided Sunnī accounts wanted to give the impression that the Kūfans were the only ones responsible for al-Ḥusayn's killing since they had refused to

[138] Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 69.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

allow him to put his hand in Yazīd's, and thus to absolve the Umayyad authorities of any responsibility.

However, ᶜUmar was satisfied with al-Ḥusayn's proposals, expecting that Ibn Ziyād would be satisfied too and would accept a compromise with al-Ḥusayn. Consequently, ᶜUmar would be released from fighting al-Ḥusayn. Therefore, ᶜUmar, according to al-Ṭabarī, wrote to Ibn Ziyād, informing him of al-Ḥusayn's proposals. So pleased was ᶜUmar with al-Ḥusayn's meeting that, at the end of his letter to Ibn Ziyād, he said, "And in this," mentioning al-Ḥusayn's proposals, "will be your satisfaction and the benefit of the community."[139]

Initially, Ibn Ziyād was satisfied with ᶜUmar's letter and seemed to want to permit al-Ḥusayn to go to the place he wished. However, Shamir Ibn Dhī al-Jawshan, one of the prominent people in Kūfa who was among those who wrote to al-Ḥusayn, changed his mind. He told Ibn Ziyād that if he permitted al-Ḥusayn to leave, he would be in a position of power and strength and Ibn Ziyād would be in a position of weakness and impotence. Shamir suggested that Ibn Ziyād ask al-Ḥusayn and his followers to submit to his authority, and, in this case, Ibn Ziyād would have the opportunity to act toward al-Ḥusayn the way he wished. He also informed him that al-Ḥusayn and ᶜUmar had been sitting between the camps talking at night. Ibn Ziyād accepted Shamir's suggestion and wrote a letter to ᶜUmar.[140]

---

[139] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 313-4. It should be noted that ᶜUmar's letter to Ibn Ziyād is reported by al-Ṭabarī exclusively.

[140] Ibid. Although Ibn Saᶜd does not mention ᶜUmar's letter to Ibn Ziyād, he states that Ibn Ziyād intended to permit al-Ḥusayn to go to any place he wished but Shamir changed his mind. *Maqtal*, p. 69.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

According to al-Ṭabarī's account, Shamir, who knew about ᶜUmar's hesitation to lead Ibn Ziyād's troops against al-Ḥusayn, might have had aspirations to take ᶜUmar's position and, for this reason, intended to bring Ibn Ziyād's wrath upon him.

In his letter to ᶜUmar, recorded by many sources, Ibn Ziyād reproached ᶜUmar for holding meetings with al-Ḥusayn. He told ᶜUmar that he had not sent him to al-Ḥusayn in order to restrain from fighting, nor to give him time, nor to promise him peace, nor to be an intercessor on his behalf. Then Ibn Ziyād ordered ᶜUmar to ask al-Ḥusayn and his followers to submit to his authority and, if they refused, to march against them and to kill them. He also instructed ᶜUmar, "If al-Ḥusayn is killed, make the horses trample on his chest and back, for he is a disobedient rebel and an oppressor." Finally, Ibn Ziyād told ᶜUmar that if he carried out his orders, he would be rewarded for it; otherwise, ᶜUmar was to leave the command of the army to Shamir.[141]

According to this letter, Ibn Ziyād regarded al-Ḥusayn as a rebel who deserved death and did not intend to permit him to go anywhere. By ordering ᶜUmar to mutilate al-Ḥusayn's body after his death, Ibn Ziyād expressed his animosity toward al-Ḥusayn and showed that he would not be satisfied with his killing only. Therefore, it is difficult to accept the account that Ibn Ziyād intended to release al-Ḥusayn from his control and to allow him to go to the place he wished.

However, when he received Ibn Ziyād's letter, ᶜUmar decided to submit to his orders, and prepare to march against al-Ḥusayn on the evening of the ninth of Muḥarram. He rode out among his men and approached al-Ḥusayn's camp. Noticing their coming, al-Ḥusayn asked his half-brother, al-ᶜAbbās, to meet ᶜUmar and his men

---

[141] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 314. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 391. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 103. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 255.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and to ascertain the reason for their approach. When al-ᶜAbbās investigated their intention, they answered that, according to the governor's demand, al-Ḥusayn and his followers should submit to his authority or be killed. Then al-Ḥusayn requested a respite of one night, and, after a discussion with ᶜUmar's men, they agreed.[142]

Al-Ḥusayn was sure that the mission of the Umayyad authorities was to kill him only, since he had refused to pay homage to Yazīd and, therefore, he believed that there was no reason for his followers to expose themselves to death. He is reported to have summoned them and his family and permitted them to leave under the cover of darkness, telling them there would be no further obligation on them. They all expressed their readiness to sacrifice themselves for him and declared that they would never leave him alone.[143]

Realizing that ᶜUmar and his men would attack him as soon as darkness vanished, al-Ḥusayn mobilized his followers after the morning prayer. He had with him thirty-two horsemen and forty foot soldiers. He put Zuhayr in charge of his right wing, Ḥabīb in charge of his left wing and gave his standard to his brother al-ᶜAbbās. He ordered the firewood and cane which was behind the tents to be set on fire, so that the enemy could only approach them from one side.[144]

Meanwhile, the next morning, ᶜUmar mobilized his followers and came out towards al-Ḥusayn's camp. ᶜAmr Ibn al-Ḥajjāj was in command of his right wing, Shamir of the

---

[142] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 316-7. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 392-3. Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p.70.
[143] Ibid., pp 70-1. Al-Ṭabarī, *T'arīkh*, 4: 317. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 105-6. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 393. Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 44.
[144] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 395. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 320. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 256. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 108. Ibn Saᶜd reports that with al-Ḥusayn there were fifty of his followers, nineteen of the Banū Hāshim and twenty persons joined him from ᶜUmar's camp. *Maqtal*, p. 69.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

left wing, ᶜAzra Ibn Qays was in command of the cavalry and Shabath Ibn Ribᶜī of the foot soldiers. He gave his standard to his *mawlā*, Dhuwayd.[145]

Al-Ḥusayn's long speech to the assembly is worth paying attention to. It was his last chance to convince the troops to change their minds and withdraw from fighting him. It is reported that, before fighting, al-Ḥusayn rode on his mount and approached Ibn Ziyād's troops. He raised his voice in a way that most of them could hear it. He asked them to listen to his advice and the reason for his coming, warning them about making a hasty decision. He said:

> ...Trace back my lineage and consider who I am. Then, look back at yourselves and remonstrate with yourselves. Consider whether it is right for you to kill me and desecrate my inviolability. Am I not the son of the daughter of your Prophet, the son of the executor of his will (*waṣī*) and his cousin...? Have you not heard the words that circulate among you that the Prophet of God said concerning myself and my brother: 'These are the two lords of the youths of the inhabitants of heaven'? ... Is this (statement) not sufficient to prevent your shedding my blood? ... If you are in doubt about this, do you have the slightest doubt that I am the son of the daughter of your Prophet?[146]

Wondering about their gathering against him, al-Ḥusayn declared that he had committed no crime and had not done any harm to them. When they all kept silent and did not respond, al-Ḥusayn called out the names of the commanders of ᶜUmar's troops who had written to him and urged him to come to Kūfa. He addressed them: "Did you not write to me that the fruit has ripened, the dates have grown green, the water has overflowed and you will come to an army which has been gathered for you?" When they denied this statement, al-Ḥusayn then asked them to let him go to a place where he

---

[145] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 321. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 395.

[146] A full narration of this account is reported by al-Ṭabarī, on the authority of Abū Mikhnaf, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 322-3. Al-Ṭabarī, The Caliphate of Yazīd b. Muᶜāwiya, *The History of al-Ṭabarī* (*Ta'rikh al-Rusul wal-Mulūk*). XIX, pp. 123-4. Similar to al-Ṭabarī's account, with some abbreviation, is the version of Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 72. Al-Balādhurī briefly mentions this report. *Ansāb*, 3: 395.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

could find safety. When Qays Ibn al-Ashᶜath, one of the chiefs of the tribes, asked him to submit to the Umayyad authorities, al-Ḥusayn refused, stating, "I will neither give them my hand like a man who has been humiliated, nor will I flee like a slave."[147]

It should be mentioned that, in his speech to ᶜUmar's army, al-Ḥusayn did not state that he was ready to put his hand in Yazīd, rather, he told them to allow him to choose a place where he could find safety. In addition, when Qays Ibn al-Ashath asked al-Ḥusayn to submit to the Umayyad authorities, he insisted that he preferred to die rather than be humiliated.

Following al-Ḥusayn's endeavors, some of his followers tried to persuade Ibn Ziyād's men to withdraw from fighting against al-Ḥusayn. Zuhayr Ibn al-Qayn, who had met with al-Ḥusayn on his way to Kūfa and decided to join him, warned Ibn Ziyād's men about God's affliction if they insisted on fighting al-Ḥusayn. He called on them to support the family of the Prophet and to withdraw from Ibn Ziyād. However, they persisted in their attitude and told him that their intention was to kill al-Ḥusayn and his followers if they refused to submit to Ibn Ziyād. He told them that supporting Fāṭima's offspring was more noble than supporting the son of Sumayya (Ibn Ziyād). Realizing their intention was not to withdraw from fighting against al-Ḥusayn, Zuhayr told them that Yazīd would be satisfied with them even without killing al-Ḥusayn.[148]

Burayr Ibn Khuḍayr, a prominent reciter of the Qur'ān in Kūfa, reproached the gathering for failing al-Ḥusayn and his family, and reminded them of their letters to al-Ḥusayn. He also criticized them for depriving him and his followers of water,

---

[147] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 323. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 396-7.
[148] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 323-4. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 397. Al-Yaᶜqūbī, who briefly mentions this account, omitts the last sentence, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 244.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

addressing them, "Do you not accept that al-Ḥusayn go back to the place from which he came?" However, Burayr received no answer.[149]

It is inconceivable that all the people who were present at Karbalā' persisted in fighting al-Ḥusayn, demanding that he and his followers submit to Ibn Ziyād. In fact, most of the these people had writen to al-Ḥusayn, urging him to lead them against the Umayyads. They marched against al-Ḥusayn only when they were under Ibn Ziyād's threat and, therefore, were enthusiastic about reaching a compromise with al-Ḥusayn and avoiding a fight. As mentioned earlier, many of them scattered before reaching Ibn Ziyād's camp when they were recruited to march against al-Ḥusayn and some of them slipped away from Ibn Ziyād and succeeded in joining al-Ḥusayn. Some others tried to reach al-Ḥusayn but failed. Many others still were willing to withdraw from Ibn Ziyād's side and join al-Ḥusayn but did not dare to do so. They came to confront al-Ḥusayn, not because they believed that he was a rebel against the legitimate caliph, Yazīd, but because they had lost their resolution to support al-Ḥusayn. Their situation, as mentioned earlier, was well described by Farazdaq when he said, "Their hearts are with you but their swords are against you."

The situation of these people is also indicated by al-Tabarī and al-Balādhurī. They narrate that a group of Kūfans who were in ᶜUmar's camp were standing on a hill, crying and asking God to send down a victory to al-Ḥusayn. Noticing this, Ibn ᶜUbayd, who was in ᶜUmar's camp as well, reproached them and said, "Why don't you go yourselves and support him?"[150]

---

[149] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 112. Al-Balādhurī narrates that Burayr and others advised ᶜUmar's men to keep their promises and reminded them of their letters to al-Ḥusayn. *Ansāb*, 3: 397.
[150] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 295. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 424.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Even al-Ḥurr, who was not among those who had written to al-Ḥusayn, tried to avoid confrontation with him along his journey to Karbalā'. As soon as he became aware of ᶜUmar's intention to fight against al-Ḥusayn, he asked him whether he had really decided to fight against the grandson of the Prophet and ᶜUmar answered in the affirmative. Al-Ḥurr was astonished and asked ᶜUmar whether he had accepted any of al-Ḥusayn's proposals which he had offered him. ᶜUmar replied that the matter was out of his hands and that he had to act according to the governor's instructions, who refused any alternative. Therefore, al-Ḥurr decided to join al-Ḥusayn and started gradually to draw closer to him until he reached al-Ḥusayn's camp and decided to sacrifice himself on behalf of al-Ḥusayn.[151]

After getting permission from al-Ḥusayn, al-Ḥurr tried to persuade the Kūfans to refrain from fighting al-Ḥusayn. In his speech, al-Ḥurr reproached them for not fulfilling their promises to al-Ḥusayn and for preventing him and his family from going to a safe place. He also reproached them for depriving al-Ḥusayn of drinking water.[152]

Al-Ṭabarī tells us that when Qurra Ibn Qays learned about al-Ḥurr's departure to al-Ḥusayn's camp, he declared that if al-Ḥurr had told him about his intention to join al-Ḥusayn, he would have joined him.[153] In fact, Qurra still had the opportunity to withdraw from ᶜUmar's camp and join al-Ḥusayn, even after al-Ḥurr had left, but he lost his courage to follow al-Ḥurr's lead.

In fact, the chiefs of the tribes, such as Shabath Ibn Rabᶜī, Ḥajjār Ibn Abjar, al-Ashᶜath Ibn Qays, and Shamir, played a major role in abandoning al-Ḥusayn and

[151] Ibid., 3: 397. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 324-5. Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 72.
[152] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 397-8. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 325-6.
[153] Ibid., 4: 325.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

supporting the Umayyads. As noted earlier, they influenced the people of Kūfa to stop supporting Ibn ᶜAqīl and played a significant role in suppressing his mission, and now they influenced them to fight against al-Ḥusayn. They were at the head of Ibn Ziyād's troops and the leaders of his army. When he reproached those who had written to him, al-Ḥusayn mentioned some of their names. These appear in most of the events of the battle of Karbalā', as was the case in the events surrounding Ibn ᶜAqīl's mission and murder.

Although these triblal leaders had written to al-Ḥusayn and urged him to come to Kūfa, their sole concern was to maintain their own positions and the narrow interests of their tribes. As noted earlier, the tribe of Madhḥij surrounded the governors' palace only when they heard that Hānī, one of the prominent leaders of their tribe, had been killed. Although they were fundamentally opposed to the Umayyad authorities, they submitted to them and put their power at the Umayyads' disposal in order to secure their own benefits. As mentioned earlier, when al-Ḥusayn asked him about the situation of the people in Kūfa, Mujammaᶜ replied that there had been much bribery among the chiefs of the tribes and noted, "Their coffers have been filled."[154]

However, Shabath Ibn Rabᶜī, one of these tribal leaders, tried to avoid fighting al-Ḥusayn by pretending that he was sick. It is also reported that, during the battle, the people noticed that Shabath was reluctant to fight. He is also reported to have stated that he had fought along with ᶜAlī against Āl Abī Sufyān, (the family of Abū Sufyān) but that then he was fighting with Muᶜāwiya and the son of Sumayya, Yazīd, against al-Ḥusayn, and reproached himself for this fickleness.[155] Ibn Ziyād's troops did not listen

[154] Ibid., 4: 306.
[155] Ibid., 4: 332.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to the advice of al-Ḥusayn and his followers and decided to follow Ibn Ziyād's orders. The fight began when ᶜUmar shot an arrow towards al-Ḥusayn's camp. ᶜUmar's intention was to prove his loyalty to Ibn Ziyād and his submission to his instructions. ᶜUmar also asked his *mawlā*, Dhuwayd, to be his witness in front of Ibn Ziyād that he had been the first to shoot.[156]

According to al-Ṭabarī and al-Balādhurī, ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn ᶜUmayr al-Kalbī was the first one to be killed of al-Ḥusayn's followers, after he had killed Ziyād's *mawlā*, Yasār, and Ibn Ziyād's *mawlā*, Sālim.[157]

Some women in al-Ḥusayn's camp also tried to participate in the fighting. Al-Ṭabarī narrates that when Ibn ᶜUmayr, who was living in Kūfa, was told that the people at al-Nukhayla were drawn up to be sent against al-Ḥusayn, he decided to escape from Kūfa and join him. When he told his wife about his intention, she decided to accompany him, and they succeeded in reaching al-Ḥusayn. She intended to fight alongside her husband, but al-Ḥusayn asked her to go back to the women, stating that there was no fighting for the women.[158] Al-Ṭabarī also reports that when al-Kalbī was killed, his wife came out and sat beside him. Noticing her, Shamir ordered his *mawlā*, Rustam, to hit her with a pole. Rustam hit her on the head and she was the first woman to be killed.[159]

The fight became one-on-one hand-to-hand combat and many of ᶜUmar's men were killed. Noticing this, ᶜAmr Ibn al-Ḥajjāj, the commander of the right wing, cried out to his men not to fight in one-on-one. He asked the people to keep their submission to the

---

[156] Ibid., 4: 326. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 398.
[157] Ibid. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 326-7.
[158] Ibid., Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 398. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 147. According to Ibn Aᶜtham, the first to be killed from al-Ḥusayn's side was al-Ḥurr.
[159] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 333-4.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Umayyad authorities, encouraging them to fight against al-Ḥusayn who had "deserted religion and disobeyed his caliph."[160]

It seems that al-Ḥusayn's supporters (al-Anṣār) decided to fight first and did not let the Banū Hāshim proceed before them because of their relationship to the Prophet. Although al-Ḥusayn's supporters declined his invitation to escape from the battle and expressed their readiness to die on his behalf, as mentioned earlier, al-Ḍaḥḥāk Ibn Qays al-Mashriqī, who was one of Abū Mikhnaf's eyewitnesses, escaped death. He promised al-Ḥusayn that he would fight with him only as long as there were fighters with him. When he saw that all of al-Ḥusayn's supporters had been killed, al-Ḍaḥḥāk reminded al-Ḥusayn of their agreement, and, finally, was successful in escaping.[161]

Al-Ḥusayn's followers fell one by one, and after this, it was the turn of the Banū Hāshim. ᶜAlī al-Akbar was the first of the Banū Hāshim to be killed and he was followed by the rest of them.[162] Although the four half-brothers of al-Ḥusayn were granted safe-conduct from Shamir on the request of their relative, ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn Abī al-Maḥall, they refused his guarantee of security and eventually were all killed.[163] It is reported that some children were killed as well in the battle, such as al-Ḥasan's sons, al-Qāsim and ᶜAbd Allāh as well as al-Ḥusayn's infant son[164]

When al-Ḥusayn was alone, he fought fiercely and tried to reach water but ᶜUmar's men prevented him and his strength was finished.[165] Although al-Ḥusayn was lying on

---

[160] Ibid., 4: 338.
[161] Ibid., 4: 339.
[162] Ibid., 4: 340. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 406.
[163] Ibid., 3:391. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 341-5, 343-5. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 103-5.
[164] Ibid., 3: 131-2. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 342, 344. Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, pp. 73-4. Al-Yaᶜqūbī narrates that al-Ḥusayn's son, who was born at that time, was killed in his arms. *Ta'rīkh*. 2: 245.
[165] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 343. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 134-6. Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 74.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the ground, ᶜUmar's men avoided killing him until Shamir ordered them to do so, and, finally, a number of ᶜUmar's men participated in killing al-Ḥusayn.[166]

Al-Masᶜūdī confirms that all those who confronted al-Ḥusayn and who were involved in his murder were from Kūfa; nobody from Syria was present. He also reports that the number of those who were killed with al-Ḥusayn was eighty-seven.[167]

While describing the forceful fighting of al-Ḥusayn's son, ᶜAlī, Ibn Aᶜtham, who habitually presents the pro-ᶜAlid point of view, states that he killed a great number of Syrians.[168] Moreover, Ibn Aᶜtham does tell us when and how the Syrian troops arrived at Karbalā' and who their commander was. But he does not mention the Syrian troops when he describes al-Ḥusayn's last moment. He reports rather that when al-Ḥusayn was alone, he came out and addressed the Kūfans. He reproached them for their wavering attitude and their failure to keep their *bayᶜa* to him.[169]

Therefore, in this chapter, we have seen how many factors led to the death of al-Ḥusayn. Firstly, the brutality of Ibn Ziyād is very important because he was willing to do anything in order to secure the favour of Yazīd. Although others might have spared al-Ḥusayn or come to a compromise, Ibn Ziyād, under Yazīd's order would not do so.

The fickleness of the Kūfans is also a key element. On the one hand, the tribal leaders were not completely loyal to al-Ḥusayn, but rather were more interested in their own benefit. On the other hand, the people of Kūfa who agreed with al-Ḥusayn's cause were not strong enough to oppose their leaders and were held back by their fear of Ibn Ziyād. Nevertheless, knowing this, especially after learning of the murder of Ibn ᶜAqīl,

---

[166] Ibid., p. 75. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 246. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 408-9. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 136.
[167] Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 3: 61. In his narration, Ibn Aᶜtham reports that seventy-two were killed of al-Ḥusayn's supporters and thirteen of the Banū Hāshim, *Futūḥ*, 3: 131.
[168] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 130-1.
[169] Ibid., 3: 133-4.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

al-Ḥusayn did not turn back. He felt that it was his obligation to oppose the illegitimate caliphate of Yazīd and could not give in. He was willing to die before pledging allegiance to Yazīd and, as we shall see in the next chapter, he left his family to bear witness to the brutality and illegitimacy of the Umayyads.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Role of the Captives After al-Ḥusayn's Murder

We have seen that al-Ḥusayn decided to comply with the Kūfans' frequent calls to come to Kūfa only when he had received confirmation from his envoy, Ibn ᶜAqīl, of their sincerity and their readiness to support him and his cause. More importantly, al-Ḥusayn received their oath of allegiance, collected by Ibn ᶜAqīl.

Al-Ḥusayn received much advice from the Banū Hāshim and other prominent persons that he should avoid the Kūfans, predicting that, because of their fickle attitude, they would disappoint him, as they had disappointed his father and brother. Nevertheless, al-Ḥusayn did not listen and persisted with his plan. He also did not pay attention to Ibn ᶜAbbās' recommendation that he leave behind his womenfolk and children. Fearing that al-Ḥusayn would be killed just like ᶜUthmān who was killed while his womenfolk and children were watching, Ibn ᶜAbbās warned al-Ḥusayn not to expose them to this jeopardy.[1]

Al-Ḥusayn was sure that, because he had refused to recognize Yazīd's caliphate, the Umayyad authorities would not leave him alone until he had paid homage to Yazīd or they had killed him wherever he resided, even in Mecca, the sanctuary for all Muslims. As already noted, al-Ḥusayn responded to Ibn ᶜAbbās and others that he would prefer to

[1] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 288. al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 374. Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 60. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 73-4.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

be killed a few inches outside Mecca than to be killed a few inches within it, in order to protect its sanctity.

But here the question is: Why did al-Ḥusayn decide to go to Kūfa rather than any other place? If he wanted to protect the sanctity of Mecca from violation, he could have gone to Yemen where he could have found many of his father's supporters, as was suggested by Ibn ᶜAbbās and his half-brother, Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya. Contrary to the Kūfans, who, since Muᶜāwiya's time, had called al-Ḥusayn several times to lead them and to rise against the Umayyad authorities, al-Ḥusayn did not receive any calls or letters from the people of Yemen. This is also supported by the fact that al-Ḥusayn did not send any letters or envoys to them, asking them for support as he had done with the people of Baṣra. In fact, our sources are silent in regard to the existence of ᶜAlī's supporters in Yemen and whether or not they were ready to support al-Ḥusayn.

As mentioned earlier, al-Ḥusayn refused the Kūfans' offer to break their allegiance to Muᶜāwiya and to rise against him, asking them to wait until his death. With their insistence, after Muᶜāwiya's death and with Ibn ᶜAqīl's optimistic letter about their attitude, al-Ḥusayn believed that his obligation was to comply with the Kūfan's call to fulfill his promise. Even with al-Ḥusayn's conviction that his duty was to respond to the Kūfan's appeal and to go to Kūfa, the question arises: Why did al-Ḥusayn refuse to follow Ibn ᶜAbbās' suggestion and take his womenfolk and children with him? Did he intend to utilize them to influence the Kūfans to fight with him? Or, did he bring them in order that they play a role after his death and expose to the masses what had happened in Karbalā'?

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

At any rate, after the battle of Karbalā', the captives, during their journey from Kūfa to Medina and through their speeches, played an important role in reproaching the Kūfans for not fulfilling their commitment to al-Ḥusayn and his family. They reminded them of their allegiance, their promises to al-Ḥusayn and their failure to fulfill their duties. This caused the Kūfans to regret their deeds and stirred up their wrath against the Umayyad authorities. Confronted by the situation of the captives and their statements and reproaches, the Kūfans started to blame themselves and to accuse the Umayyad officials for what had happened to the grandson of the Prophet.

Although the Kūfans admitted the leading position of al-Ḥusayn and, therefore, called him to lead them to rise against the Umayyads, they did not keep their commitments and turned against him. Under Ibn Ziyād's threat, they lost their determination and fought against al-Ḥusayn, though they were unwilling to participate in his killing and their sentiments were with him. This is made more understandable by the account of Ḥumayd Ibn Muslim, a frequent narrator of Abū Mikhnaf's and an eye-witness who was in ᶜUmar's camp. He reported that, after killing al-Ḥusayn, some people in ᶜUmar's camp reproached Sinān Ibn Anas, who had beheaded al-Ḥusayn. According to al-Ṭabarī, they told him, "You killed the son of ᶜAlī and the son of Fāṭima, the most important person of the Arabs who came to remove the Umayyads from their sovereignty." They also addressed him, "If they [the Umayyad authorities] give you all their wealth in exchange for al-Ḥusayn's murder, it will be little for you."[2]

[2] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 347.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Sinān himself admitted his high esteem for al-Ḥusayn's position and the importance of his kinship. It is reported that when he came to ᶜUmar's tent, Sinān recited some verses in which he announced that he had killed a saintly man, stating:

> Fill my stirrup with silver or gold
> For I have killed the sacred master
> I have killed the best man in regard to mother and father.[3]

Although Sinān beheaded al-Ḥusayn, he confessed that al-Ḥusayn was the best descendent of the best parents and that he did not kill him because he believed that he was a rebel against the caliph; rather, he killed al-Ḥusayn only for the sake of money.

Soon after the battle of Karbalā', the Kūfans recognized their fault in deceiving al-Ḥusayn. Even the women, who played a momentous role in the failure of Ibn ᶜAqīl's mission by influencing their relatives to desert him, now performed a different function after al-Ḥusayn's death. They reproached their husbands for participating in al-Ḥusayn's killing, causing them to feel regret for their deeds. It is reported that Khawalī was in charge of al-Ḥusayn's head and was instructed by ᶜUmar to hand it over to Ibn Ziyād. When he saw that the doors of the governor's palace were closed, he came to his house. Noticing al-Ḥusayn's head in her house, Khawalī's wife, al-Nawwār, criticized him for holding al-Ḥusayn's head and decided not to talk to him anymore.[4]

It is also reported that when Kaᶜb Ibn Jābir, who had killed Burayr, one of al-Ḥusayn's prominent supporters in Kūfa, returned to his house, his wife condemned him for killing Burayr, "the master of the readers of Qur'ān." She also reproached him for

---

[3] Ibid. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 410. Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, pp. 75-75. Al-Masᶜudī, *Murūj*, 3: 61. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 40. Ibn Saᶜd, Ibn Aᶜtham and al-Masᶜūdī narrate that these verses were recited in front of Ibn Ziyād, and, according to Ibn Saᶜd and Ibn Aᶜtham, Khawalī was the person who beheaded al-Ḥusayn.
[4] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 348. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 411.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

taking part in al-Ḥusayn's killing, telling him that he had committed a great sin and that she had decided to abandon him.[5]

The guilty feelings of the Kūfans after al-Ḥusayn's death were amplified by the captives in their deeds and speeches. They exposed the disastrous consequences of the Kūfans' desertion of al-Ḥusayn's cause and their shameful treatment of the household of the Prophet. They also moved the masses against the Umayyads by causing them to suffer more remorse for betraying al-Ḥusayn.

It is reported that the captives, who were taken to Kūfa with ᶜUmar, passed by al-Ḥusayn's body. Noticing it, his sister, Zaynab, cried out: "O Muḥammad! This is al-Ḥusayn, covered with his blood; his organs are cut to pieces, your daughters are prisoners and your progeny are killed." She reportedly made every enemy and friend weep.[6] According to this account, even the supporters of the Umayyads who had participated in al-Ḥusayn's killing were moved by the captives.

Ibn Aᶜtham and al-Yaᶜqūbī narrate that, as the captives approached Kūfa, its people received them with sorrow and weeping. Noticing their grief, ᶜAlī Ibn al-Ḥusayn expressed his surprise and commented, "If these people are crying for us, then who killed us?"[7]

According to Ibn Aᶜtham, Zaynab protested their weeping, accusing them of being hypocrites for abandoning al-Ḥusayn to be killed alone. She also informed them that they had committed a crime against the Prophet's grandson which could not be repaired. Mentioning their fickleness and their failure to keep their promises, she said, "You

---

[5] Ibid., 3: 399. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 329. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 115. According to Ibn Aᶜtham, Baḥr Ibn Aws killed Burayr. His cousin censured him for killing a pious man, stating, "In which face will you meet Allāh tomorrow (in the hereafter)," and Baḥr regretted what he had done.

[6] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 349. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 411-2. Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 79.

[7] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 139. Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 245.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

became just like a woman who unraveled the thread, after she had made it strong, making your oaths deceit between you." Zaynab told them that with the crime of al-Ḥusayn's killing, "You have come to the wrath of God and humiliation surrounds you." She explained that they had violated the sanctity of the son of the last Prophet and said:

> Do you know what liver of the Prophet you have split? What blood of him you have shed? What women of his family you have dishonored? Surely, you have committed a disastrous thing, whereby the heavens are almost torn, the earth split and the mountains fallen in ruins."

She finally warned them of a punishment in the hereafter and God's vengeance, and the Kūfans became embarrassed and regretful.[8]

How impressed were the Kūfans by the appeal and call of the captives and by Zaynab's speech? Ibn Sa^{c}d narrates, on the authority of ^{c}Alī Ibn al-Ḥusayn, that upon leaving Kūfa, the captives could not pass the streets of Kūfa until night, because they were crowded by Kūfans who were weeping for them.[9] Even ^{c}Umar Ibn Sa^{c}d, the commander of Ibn Ziyād's troops, was reported to have regretted what he had done to al-Ḥusayn. He said, "I have submitted to the unjust man, Ibn Ziyād, disobeyed God and cut the bond of my kinship with al-Ḥusayn."[10]

However, Ibn Ziyād was holding an assembly for the people of Kūfa, celebrating the victory of the caliph over his enemies. Ḥumayd Ibn Muslim reported that when he went to visit Ibn Ziyād, he found that delegations (*wufūd*) had already come to the governor's palace. Ḥumayd noticed al-Ḥusayn's head in front of Ibn Ziyād; who was poking his teeth with a cane. When Zayd Ibn Arqam (d. 68/687), a companion of the Prophet, saw what Ibn Ziyād was doing, he ordered him to raise the cane from al-Ḥusayn's teeth, crying out,

---

[8] Ibn A^{c}tham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 140-1.
[9] Ibn Sa^{c}d, *Maqtal*, p. 89.
[10] Ibid., p. 81. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 414.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"I have seen the lips of the Apostle of God kiss those lips." Zayd also, after watching Ibn Ziyād's disrespect toward al-Ḥusayn's head, predicted what would happen to the whole community, announcing:

> A slave (Yazīd) has given power to a slave (Ibn Ziyād) and has made the people his inheritance. You, Arabs, are the slaves after today. You have killed the son of Fāṭima when Ibn Marjāna (Ibn Ziyād) ordered you. He will kill the best among you and enslave the evil among you. You have accepted humiliation. Let destruction come to those who accept humiliation.[11]

This was the first open protest against Ibn Ziyād since his arrival in Kūfa. Before al-Ḥusayn's killing, nobody had dared to raise a voice against Ibn Ziyād. When he had imprisoned the leader of Madhḥij and later killed him, no member of his tribe had dared to save him or even object to Ibn Ziyād. Now Zayd criticized him openly for his disgraceful treatment of al-Ḥusayn's head. He also condemned the Kūfans for their failure to oppose Ibn Ziyād or protest against him. Zayd Ibn Arqam described the Kūfans as slaves who had lost their determination, since they had submitted to Ibn Ziyād's orders and killed the Prophet's grandson after they had invited him and paid him their allegiance.

Another account is narrated by Ibn Sa^{c}d and al-Balādhurī who report that when Mālik Ibn Anas (59/679), a companion of the Prophet, saw Ibn Ziyād poking al-Ḥusayn's teeth, he said to him, "I will make you displeased." He told him that he had seen the Prophet kissing the place on al-Ḥusayn's lips where Ibn Ziyād was poking.[12]

---

[11] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 349. Al-Ṭabarī, The Caliphate of Yazīd. *The History of al-Ṭabarī*, XIX, p. 165. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 312-3. Ibn Sa^{c}d, *Maqtal*, p. 80. Zayd's last statement is not included in Ibn Sa^{c}d's version.

[12] Ibn Sa^{c}d, *Maqtal*, p. 80. Al-Balādhurī, on the authority of Anas Ibn Mālik, *al-Balādhurī*, 3: 421.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

It should be mentioned that neither Anas nor Ibn Arqam had objected to Ibn Ziyād when he had killed al-Ḥusayn's envoy, Ibn ᶜAqīl. They also did not show their resistance to Ibn Ziyād when he recruited the Kūfans to fight against al-Ḥusayn. After al-Ḥusayn's murder and the ill-treatment of his family, and after their coming to Kūfa as prisoners, many voices were raised against Ibn Ziyād, focusing on his treatment of al-Ḥusayn's head.

Another assembly was held by Ibn Ziyād in which he ordered the captives, with al-Ḥusayn's head, to be presented in his palace. Zaynab is reported to have disguised herself so that Ibn Ziyād could not recognize her. When Ibn Ziyād was told about her presence, he tried to provoke her by expressing his pleasure at killing al-Ḥusayn. He also wanted to persuade the attendees that killing al-Ḥusayn was a victory for the caliph, bestowed on him by God. Ibn Ziyād sought to clarify that al-Husayn had claimed that Yazīd's caliphate was illegitimate and that he was more entitled than he, but that God aborted his false claim. Mentioning what had happen to al-Ḥusayn and his followers, Ibn Ziyād said to Zaynab, "Praise be to God, who has disgraced you (*faḍaḥakum*), killed you (*qatalakum*) and abolished the false nature of your claim (*akdhaba uḥduthatakum*)." In her response, Zaynab wanted to emphasize that al-Ḥusayn was among the family of the Prophet whom God had purified, as He mentioned in the Qur'ān,[13] and that, therefore, he would never commit any transgression. Refuting Ibn Ziyād's statement, she replied, "Praise be to God, who has favored us with the Prophet Muḥammad and has purified us completely from sin. He only disgraces the great sinner and eliminates the false nature of the reckless." Then, Ibn Ziyād asked her, "What do you think of how God has treated

[13] Qur'ān, 33: 33. "...Allāh only desires to keep away the uncleanness from you, O people of the House [of the Prophet] and to purify you a thorough purifying."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

your family?" Again, Ibn Ziyād wanted to claim that what had happened to al-Ḥusayn and his family was only a punishment by God for al-Ḥusayn's rebellion. She replied, "God decreed death for them and they went forward bravely to their resting places, and God will gather you and them (in the hereafter) and you will dispute with each other before Him." Ibn Ziyād became enraged with anger but ᶜAmr Ibn Ḥurayth intervened and asked Ibn Ziyād not to hold her responsible for anything she said and not to blame her mistakes, as she was "only a woman." Ibn Ziyād wanted to claim to the audience, as he had done before with Ibn ᶜAqīl, that al-Ḥusayn and his followers deserved death because of their rebellion against the caliph. Ibn Ziyād said to her, "God has healed my soul from the tyrannical, rebellious, and disobedient members of your family."[14]

Ibn Ziyād tried to announce to the masses that al-Ḥusayn was a rebel against the legal caliph, Yazīd, and that his killing was a victory for the caliph granted to him by God. He summoned the Kūfans in the great mosque and delivered a speech to them, saying, "Praise be to God, who has disclosed the truth and its followers; He has given victory to the Commander of the Faithful, Yazīd Ibn Muᶜāwiya and his party. He has killed the liar who is the son of a liar, al-Ḥusayn Ibn ᶜAlī and his Shīᶜa."[15] ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn ᶜAfīf al-Azdī, who had been one of ᶜAlī's supporters and who had lost both of his eyes at the battles of the Camel and Ṣiffīn,[16] was present in the mosque. He interrupted Ibn Ziyād and shouted to him, "Son of Marjāna, the ones who are liars and sons of liars are you, your father and the man who appointed you and his father. You are killing the sons of the Prophets and trying to speak the language of true men." Ibn Ziyād was astonished to see somebody confronting him and rejecting his statement; he ordered his men to seize Ibn ᶜAfīf. Upon

[14] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 349-50. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 124-134. Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 79.
[15] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 351. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 413. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 144.
[16] Ibid. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 351. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 413.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

being seized, Ibn ᶜAfīf gave the battle cry of his tribe, al-Azd, asking for help. The people of Azd, who numbered as seven hundred men in Kūfa, rescued him from Ibn Ziyād's men and took him to his family.[17]

Although al-Ṭabarī reports this account on the authority of Ḥumayd Ibn Muslim, the main narrator of Abū Mikhnaf, he abbreviates this event, stating that Ibn ᶜAfīf was brought to Ibn Ziyād, who ordered him to be crucified.[18] Even though neither mentions authorities for this account, the full account of Ibn ᶜAfīf's protest is provided by al-Balādhurī and Ibn ᶜAtham with some differences.

According to this account, Ibn Ziyād followed in the footsteps of his father, who had exploited the chiefs of the tribes by suppressing Ḥujr's protest. Since Ibn ᶜAfīf was protected by his tribe, al-Azd, Ibn Ziyād resorted to the tribal leaders and sought their assistance, and they, once again, played a vital role by capturing Ibn ᶜAfīf. Following ᶜAmr Ibn al-Ḥajjāj's suggestion, Ibn Ziyād, according to al-Balādhurī, imprisoned some of the prominent people of al-Azd in order to compel their tribe to stop protecting Ibn ᶜAfīf. Meanwhile, Ibn Ziyād sent some of his troops from Yemen to arrest Ibn ᶜAfīf. After a fierce battle between the people of Yemen and the people of Azd, Ibn Ziyād's troops succeeded in capturing Ibn ᶜAfīf. When Ibn ᶜAfīf was brought to Ibn Ziyād, he was ordered to be crucified.[19]

Following his father's course, Ibn Ziyād subdued Ibn ᶜAfīf's protest only when he manipulated the feud amongst the tribes and by resorting to the tribal leaders of Kūfa. According to Ibn ᶜAtham, the tribal leaders of Kūfa suggested to Ibn Ziyād that he imprison the prominent persons of Azd, because they had rescued Ibn ᶜAfīf from Ibn

[17] Ibid. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 351. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 414.
[18] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 351.
[19] Al-Baldhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 414.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Ziyād's men. Following their suggestion, Ibn Ziyād imprisoned the leaders of Azd, trying to force their tribe to bring Ibn ᶜAfīf to him. He also sent some tribal leaders, who were the leaders of ᶜUmar's troops at the battle of Karbalā', such as, ᶜAmr Ibn al-Ḥajjāj, ᶜAmr Ibn al-Ashᶜath and Shabath Ibn Ribᶜī to capture Ibn ᶜAfīf. Ibn Aᶜtham narrates that some tribes of Yemen refused to submit to Ibn Ziyād's order to fight the Azd; rather, they decided to join al-Azd in protecting Ibn ᶜAfīf. Hearing this, Ibn Ziyād gathered the tribes of Muḍar and ordered them to join Ibn al-Ashᶜath's men. A vigorous fight between Ibn Ziyād's men and the defenders of Ibn ᶜAfīf took place, and, finally, Ibn Ziyād's men reached Ibn ᶜAfīf's house, captured him and brought him to Ibn Ziyād.[20] Avoiding the actual reason of Ibn ᶜAfīf's protest against the Umayyad authorities, Ibn Ziyād tried to provoke the wrath of the people against Ibn ᶜAfīf by accusing him of being a rebel against the legitimate caliph and saying that he was making slurs against the third caliph, ᶜUthmān. He asked Ibn ᶜAfīf, "What is your opinion about ᶜUthmān?" Realizing Ibn Ziyād's intention, Ibn ᶜAfīf turned away from talking about ᶜUthmān and tried to focus on Ibn Ziyād and Yazīd. He replied, "You have nothing to do with ᶜUthmān, whether he committed good or bad deeds... but ask me about you and your father, and Yazīd and his father." Hearing this, Ibn Ziyād discontinued his discussion, telling Ibn ᶜAfīf that he would not ask him about anything before he had tasted death, and ordered him to be beheaded and crucified.[21]

Ibn Ziyād, who had taught the Kūfans to submit to his orders without objection when he arrived in Kūfa was, after al-Ḥusayn's killing and the arrival of the captives, attacked by Ibn ᶜAfīf. Ibn ᶜAfīf's opposition was transformed into a movement against Ibn Ziyād

[20] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 144-5.
[21] Ibid., 3: 145-6.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

when his tribe, al-Azd, and, according to Ibn A^{c}tham, some of the tribes of Yemen, tried to defend him from the governor's men. A battle took place between Ibn ^{c}Afīf's defenders and Ibn Ziyād's men. The questions that arise here are: Why did these tribes fail to defend Ibn ^{c}Aqīl or fight for him? Why did the tribe of Madhḥij not dare to save Hānī from Ibn Ziyād's prison? What was the impact of the captives on the people of Kūfa?

Having fulfilled his task of preventing al-Ḥusayn from entering Kūfa and killing him, and also by controlling the situation in Kūfa, Ibn Ziyād now decided to inform Yazīd about this great victory. He also intended to send al-Ḥusayn's head and those of his followers along with the captives to Damascus, but he was waiting for Yazīd's orders.

According to Ibn Sa^{c}d and al-Ṭabarī, on the authority of ^{c}Awāna, Yazīd sent his messenger to Ibn Ziyād, asking him to send him al-Ḥusayn's women and the rest of his family.[22] Before doing this, Ibn Ziyād dispatched Zaḥr Ibn Qays with al-Ḥusayn's head and the heads of his followers, ordering him to describe to Yazīd what had happened at Karbalā'. Zaḥr considered al-Ḥusayn's killing a triumph for the caliph bestowed on him by God, and hailed Yazīd for this great victory. Describing the battle at Karbalā', Zaḥar told Yazīd that al-Ḥusayn and his followers had refused to submit to Ibn Ziyād's order and had chosen to fight. According to Zaḥr, when al-Ḥusayn and his followers were surrounded by the troops, they scattered, trying to escape and to find shelter, and in no time, they were all killed. He went on to say, "These are their naked bodies, their clothes overwhelmed by blood, and their cheeks burned by the Sun."[23] Hearing this, Yazīd expressed to his men that he would have been satisfied with them even without killing al-

[22] Ibn Sa^{c}d, *Maqtal*, p. 81. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 354.
[23] Ibid., 4: 351-2. Ibn Sa^{c}d, *Maqtal*, pp. 81-2. Ibn A^{c}tham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 148-9.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Ḥusayn and cursed Ibn Ziyād for his deed.[24] According to some sources, Yazīd's eyes were even filled with tears when he heard the story of al-Ḥusayn's killing.[25]

The questions presenting themselves here are: Did not Yazīd really intend to kill al-Ḥusayn if he refused to acknowledge his caliphate? Would Yazīd have been satisfied with Ibn Ziyād and the people of Iraq if they had left al-Ḥusayn go free without paying homage to him? Did he curse Ibn Ziyād in order to remove any responsibility from his shoulders for killing al-Ḥusayn and to avoid the wrath of the people against him? If Yazīd was not satisfied with al-Ḥusayn's killing, then why did he allow Ibn Ziyād to send al-Ḥusayn's head to him and treat it in a humiliating way?

It is reported that when al-Ḥusayn's head was brought before Yazīd, he looked at it and recited:

> We will split the skull of men who are dear to us
> But they were more disobedient and oppressive.[26]

In his account, Ibn Sa^{c}d narrates that Yazīd was poking al-Ḥusayn's mouth while he was reciting this verse. Hearing of Yazīd's treatment of al-Ḥusayn's head, a man from al-Ansār protested and asked him to keep his cane away from al-Ḥusayn's mouth, explaining, "I have seen the Prophet kissing the place where you put your cane."[27]

Al-Ṭabarī and al-Balādhurī narrate that when Marwān's brother, Yaḥyā, heard Yazīd's verse, he protested, reciting the following:

> The heads on the plain (*taff*) were closer in kinship (to Yazīd)
> than Ibn Ziyād, the slave with the false lineage.
> The offspring of Sumayya (Yazīd's mother) have become as numerous as stones
> while the daughter of the Apostle of God has lost her offspring.

---

[24] Ibid., 3: 149. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 351-2. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 415. Ibn Sa^{c}d, *Maqtal*, p. 82.
[25] Ibid. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 352.
[26] Ibn A^{c}tham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 150. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 416. Al-Ṭabarī, *Tar'īkh*, 4: 352.
[27] Ibn Sa^{c}d, *Maqtal*, p. 82

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Hearing this, Yazīd struck his hand against the chest of Yaḥyā and ordered him to be silent.[28]

According to many sources, when Abū Barza al-Aslamī (d. 65/684), a companion of the Prophet, saw what Yazīd was doing with al-Ḥusayn's head, he cried out to Yazīd to take away his cane from al-Ḥusayn's mouth, explaining:

> As for you, Yazīd, you will come forward on the Day of Resurrection (*yawm al-qiyāma*) and Ibn Ziyād will be your advocate (*shafīᶜuk*). But this man (al-Ḥusayn) will come forward on the Day of Resurrection and the Prophet Muḥammad will be his advocate.[29]

According to the above-mentioned accounts, it is clear that many people, including a Companion of the Prophet, condemned Yazīd's treatment of al-Ḥusayn's head and charged him with the main responsibility for al-Ḥusayn's killing. Because of Yazīd's order, Ibn Ziyād had dared to kill al-Ḥusayn.

It is also reported that when al-Ḥusayn's family were brought to Yazīd, he summoned the nobles of Syria to witness his victory. In his discussion with ᶜAlī Ibn al-Ḥusayn, Yazīd wanted to explain the reason for al-Ḥusayn's killing: "Your father cut the bond of kinship with me, showed ignorance of my rights and tried to deprive me of my position of authority. God has treated him in the way you have seen."[30]

According to this account, Yazīd believed that he was a legitimate caliph and that al-Ḥusayn was a rebel and a wrongdoer when he did not acknowledge his caliphate. He believed that because of his refusal, God had punished him. It should be noted that, in this account, Yazīd did not mention to the assembly that Ibn Ziyād had killed al-Ḥusayn. This

---

[28] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 352. Al-Ṭabarī, The Caliphate of Yazīd. *The History of al-Ṭabarī*, XIX, p. 170. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 421.
[29] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 356. Al-Ṭabarī, The Caliphate of Yazīd. *The History of al-Ṭabarī*, XIX, p. 176. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 150. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 416. Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 3: 61.
[30] Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 83. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 352. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 152.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

means that Yazīd was satisfied with al-Ḥusayn's killing, but intended to demonstrate that he was not responsible for it; instead, he claimed, it was a consequence of al-Ḥusayn's rebellion, and done by God.

Moreover, Yazīd considered al-Ḥusayn's killing to be a victory bestowed on him by God and that his women, according to al-Ṭabarī, were captives with whom he could do anything he wanted. Al-Ṭabarī reports, on the authority of Abū Mikhnaf, that when the captives were brought to Yazīd, a man from Syria thought that the captives were slaves brought from war. He asked Yazīd to allow him to keep Fāṭima, ᶜAlī's daughter, in his house as a slave girl. Because of this demand, a heated exchange between Zaynab and Yazīd took place. Zaynab explained to the gathering that they were not slaves captured by war. Rather, she argued, they belonged to the Prophet and nobody had the right to have control over them. She retorted to the man that neither he nor Yazīd had any right to enslave them. Yazīd angrily responded, "You lie. By God I have the right to do so, and if I want to do that I will do it." Zaynab answered, "God has not permitted you to do that, and if you do, you will have departed from our religion and assumed another religion." Yazīd responded, "Your father and your brother (al-Ḥusayn) deserted the religion." She said, "Because of God's religion, my father's religion, my brother's religion and my grandfather's religion, you and your father were guided." The discussion ended when Yazīd refuted Zaynab's statement, stating, "You lie, O enemy of God."[31]

In his brief report in regard to the above-mentioned discussion, Ibn Aᶜtham, unlike his Shīᶜī accounts in describing Yazīd, narrates that when a man from Syria asked Yazīd to give him "this slave girl," mentioning a girl from among al-Ḥusayn's womenfolk,

[31] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 353. Al-Balādhurī briefly mentions this account. *Ansāb*, 3: 417.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Yazīd reproached him, stating, "She is the daughter of ᶜAlī and Fāṭima."[32] This means that some accounts want to exaggerate Yazīd's treatment of the captives.

Yazīd's attitude regarding al-Ḥusayn's killing was not consistent; according to some accounts, he condemned Ibn Ziyād as being responsible for al-Ḥusayn's murder; according to others, he believed that al-Ḥusayn's killing was a punishment by God because of his rebellion. Although Yazīd outwardly articulated regret for al-Ḥusayn's killing, still he did not hesitate to poke his head with his cane. Yazīd's unsettled attitude would be more clear from the reports below.

Al-Ṭabarī reports that when Yazīd's wife, ᶜĀtika, heard that Yazīd had put al-Ḥusayn's head in front of him, she came out and angrily condemned him for humiliating al-Ḥusayn, "the son of Fāṭima, the daughter of the Prophet." Hearing this, Yazīd asked her to lament for him and said that Ibn Ziyād had killed him and that Allāh would punish Ibn Ziyād for his deed. Nevertheless, al-Ṭabarī reports that after this, Yazīd permitted the people to enter his palace in order to watch him poking al-Ḥusayn's mouth.[33]

Al-Ṭabarī and al-Balādhurī report that when the women captives were brought to Yazīd's family, Yazīd's women and Muᶜāwiya's daughters shared with them the lamentation of al-Ḥusayn's killing.[34] In another report, Yazīd ordered his women to lament al-Ḥusayn's killing.[35]

Did Yazīd intend to calm the situation by permitting his wife and his women to lament al-Ḥusayn and by expressing his regret for al-Ḥusayn's death?

---

[32] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 153.
[33] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 356.
[34] Al-Ṭabarī, on the authority of ᶜAwāna. *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 355. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 417.
[35] Ibid., 3: 417. Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 83.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Al-Ṭabarī reports, on the authority of ᶜAwāna, that Fāṭima, al-Ḥusayn's daughter, reproached Yazīd for their plight, stating, "O Yazīd! The daughters of the messenger of God are captives!" Yazīd answered that he was unwilling to see that.[36]

The fickle attitude of Yazīd towards al-Ḥusayn's killing is more understandable from Ibn Saᶜd's account. Ibn Saᶜd narrates that when the womenfolk of al-Ḥusayn were brought to Yazīd, Sakīna, al-Ḥusayn's daughter, said, "O Yazīd! The daughters of the messenger of God are captives!" He replied that their situation was harder on him than on her, declaring that Ibn Ziyād was responsible for al-Ḥusayn's death. He expressed that he would have been satisfied with the Iraqīs' obedience to him without killing al-Ḥusayn, but that "Ibn Ziyād killed him rapidly."[37]

According to Ibn Saᶜd, Yazīd also confirmed that if he could have prevented al-Ḥusayn from being murdered, he would have done so, even at the expense of his own life. Nevertheless, he still believed that al-Ḥusayn was a rebel and wrongdoer for denouncing his caliphate, and that he had deserved this fate, which had been inflicted on him by God. Then Yazīd turned to ᶜAlī Ibn al-Ḥusayn and told him that his father had cut the bond of kinship with Yazīd and had tried to deprive him of his position of authority, and that, therefore, God had treated him in this way because of his deeds.[38]

Ibn Aᶜtham also reports that when Yazīd heard the story of al-Ḥusayn's killing, he cursed Ibn Ziyād and confirmed that he would have prevented al-Ḥusayn's death even at the cost of the killing some of his sons. Yet, after that, he put al-Ḥusayn's head in front of him and started poking it with his cane.[39] However, ᶜAlī Ibn al-Ḥusayn believed that

---

[36] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 355.
[37] Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 83
[38] Ibid.
[39] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 149-50.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Yazīd was responsible for al-Ḥusyan's killing. According to Ibn Aᶜtham, he condemned Yazīd for what he had done to his father and his family and for degrading al-Ḥusayn by putting his head up on the main gate of Damascus.[40]

Ibn Aᶜtham also narrates that Yazīd called for a general assembly in his palace to explain to the people the reason for al-Ḥusayn's killing. He asked a preacher to stand on the pulpit and tell the people about al-Ḥusayn's disobedience to him, that al-Ḥusayn had done wrong to Yazīd, and to praise Yazīd and his father. The preacher followed Yazīd's request. When he finished, ᶜAlī Ibn al-Ḥusayn asked Yazīd to permit him to deliver a speech to the people. Initially, Yazīd refused ᶜAlī's demand, fearing that he would give a bad impression of Yazīd and his family. Only at the insistence of some nobles did Yazīd reluctantly allowed him to speak. At the beginning of his speech, ᶜAlī introduced himself to the audience and started to enumerate the merits of his ancestors. When he came to his father and described the way he was killed, the people started to weep. Fearing a disturbance, Yazīd interrupted ᶜAlī's speech and he ordered the preacher to call for the prayer.[41]

Yazīd insisted that al-Ḥusayn was a rebel against the legitimate caliph and that he had been killed because of his rebellion. Therefore, Yazīd, according to Ibn Saᶜd and al-Balādhurī, sent al-Ḥusayn's head to his governor of Medina, ᶜAmr Ibn Saᶜīd.[42] Perhaps Yazīd intended to announce his victory over al-Ḥusayn's rebellion to the people of Medina and to make al-Ḥusayn an example for whoever else wished to oppose the Umayyad authorities.

---

[40] Ibid., 3: 153-4.
[41] Ibid., 3: 154-5.
[42] Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 84. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 419.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Not only Yazīd, but also the governor of Medina, changed his attitude in regards to al-Ḥusayn's killing. At the beginning, when he received the news of al-Ḥusayn's killing, ᶜAmr was pleased with the news and announced his death to the people of Medina,[43] and, according to al-Balādhurī, displayed al-Ḥusayn's head to the people.[44] But, when ᶜAmr saw the grief of the people of Medina who were agitated by al-Ḥusayn's head and weeping for him, he changed his attitude and declared that he wished that Yazīd had not sent al-Ḥusayn's head to him.[45] Ibn Saᶜd also reports that ᶜAmr declared that he wished that al-Ḥusayn's head was still on his body and that he had not been killed.[46]

Although Yazīd cursed Ibn Ziyād and accused him of al-Ḥusayn's killing, he neither punished him nor deprived him of his office; he only condemned him in front of the people. Ibn Aᶜtham reports that, Ibn Ziyād remained in his office as the governor of Baṣra and Kūfa and that his position became stronger than before. Moreover, Yazīd granted him one thousand dirhams as a gift for his submission to his orders.[47] Al-Masᶜūdī also narrates that Yazīd met with Ibn Ziyād after al-Ḥusayn's killing and Yazīd praised Ibn Ziyād's loyalty in verse.[48]

Yazīd was also satisfied with the Kūfans who had participated in al-Ḥusayn's killing and rewarded them for their submission to the Umayyads. According to al-Balādhurī, on the authority of Mujālid Ibn Saᶜīd, Yazīd asked Ibn Ziyād to increase the payment of those people in Kūfa who were loyal to the Umayyads.[49]

---

[43] Ibid., 3: 417. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 356-7. Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 85.
[44] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 418.
[45] Ibid,. 3: 417, 418.
[46] Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 85.
[47] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futuḥ*, 3: 165.
[48] Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 3: 67.
[49] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*. 3: 420.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

According to al-Ṭabarī, Ibn Ziyād declared that he had followed Yazīd's order in killing al-Ḥusayn. Al-Ṭabarī reports that Yazīd sent a letter to Ibn Ziyād, ordering him to kill Ibn al-Zubayr, who refused to recognize Yazīd's caliphate. Realizing that killing Ibn al-Zubayr, who took refuge in Mecca, would mean invading the holy city, Ibn Ziyād refused to comply. He affirmed that he was not ready to commit two crimes through following Yazīd's orders: killing al-Ḥusayn and invading Mecca.[50] According to Ibn Ziyād's statement, Yazīd, who ordered him to invade Mecca and to kill Ibn al-Zubayr, had also ordered him to kill al-Ḥusayn.

According to al-Yaᶜqūbī and al-Balādhurī, Ibn ᶜAbbās had no doubt that Yazīd was responsible for al-Ḥusayn's killing and that he had ordered Ibn Ziyād to kill him. They report that Ibn ᶜAbbās refused Ibn al-Zubayr's request to pay allegiance to him. Hearing this, Yazīd was pleased and tried to coax Ibn ᶜAbbās to his side. He sent a letter to Ibn ᶜAbbās, praising him for his attitude towards Ibn al-Zubayr and asking him to prevent his relatives from paying allegiance to Ibn al-Zubayr. Ibn ᶜAbbās refused, reminding Yazīd of ordering Ibn Ziyād to fight and kill al-Ḥusayn and his followers. He also condemned Yazīd for taking al-Ḥusayn's family as captives to Damascus.[51]

In his will to Yazīd,[52] Muᶜāwiya expected that the people of Kūfa would call al-Ḥusayn to lead them against the Umayyad authorities, as they had called him frequently in the time of Muᶜāwiya. He also predicted that al-Ḥusayn would comply with the Kūfans' call and revolt against Yazīd, since he had refused to recognize Yazīd's caliphate. Muᶜāwiya realized that, because of his close relationship to the Prophet and his

---

[50] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 371.
[51] Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 248-50. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5: 321-2. This account contradicts Hawting's statement that Ibn ᶜAbbās is said "...to have spoken favorably of him [Yazīd]..." See his "Yazīd (I) B. Muᶜāwiya," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 11: 310.
[52] See page 115, footnote, 85.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

leading position among the people, al-Ḥusayn's death would cause immense upheaval among them and, consequently, would undermine Yazīd's caliphate. Therefore, Muᶜāwiya warned Yazīd against committing any harm to al-Ḥusayn.

Yazīd did not listen to his father's advice and was anxious to get the *bayᶜa* from al-Ḥusayn. According to his letter to the governor of Medina, Yazīd decided not to leave al-Ḥusayn alone unless he paid homage to him. He ordered Ibn Ziyād to go to Kūfa and permitted him to take whatever measures he might need to in order to subdue al-Ḥusayn's revolt. He showed that he was satisfied with what Ibn Ziyād had done to al-Ḥusayn; he did not deprive him of his office but rather rewarded him and did not even ask him why he had ordered his troops to trample on al-Ḥusayn's body after his death.

Yazīd considered al-Ḥusayn's killing as a victory and took his family as captives. He did not realize that al-Ḥusayn's killing would move the people to the extent that even Yazīd's own family would lament al-Ḥusayn. Al-Ḥusayn's family, who were taken as prisoners from Karbalā' to Kūfa and from Kūfa to Damascus with al-Ḥusayn's head, incited the people against the authorities. Realizing this, Yazīd changed his attitude and treated al-Ḥusayn's family leniently.[53] He expressed his regret for al-Ḥusayn's killing and declared that Ibn Ziyād was responsible and cursed him.

Thus, al-Ḥusayn's family played a very significant role after his murder. He could have left them behind many times but he did not. He needed them to tell the people what had happened to him and agitate them against their illegitimate rulers. They did this in Kūfa and Damascus and Yazīd could not help but be affected by it. He knew he had to placate the people and so, condemned Ibn Ziyād publicly while supporting him privately.

---

[53] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 355. Al-Balādhurī, Ansāb, 3: 417.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Yazīd was able to hold on to his caliphate, but, just like his father Muᶜāwiya, he could not hide all the evidence of his lack of qualifications. Through al-Ḥusayn's murder and the role of his family, the people were reminded of the illegitimacy of the Umayyad regime.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Conclusion

In this thesis, we have been looking at the circumstances surrounding al-Ḥusayn's uprising and murder, using the classical Arabic sources on the subject. Our reading of these sources has led us to several conclusions about what led to al-Ḥusayn's uprising, his actual uprising and death and finally, the aftermath of these events. Let us now provide a summary of what our findings have been.

Our first finding is that al-Ḥusayn's uprising and his consequent death are directly connected to the matter of the caliphate. He refused to recognize Yazīd's caliphate because he considered it as illegitimate due to the fact that Yazīd was not qualified to assume such an important office. Not only al-Ḥusayn, but also the prominent nobles of the Muslim community rejected Yazīd's caliphate because of his irreligious behavior.

Furthermore, al-Ḥusayn, his father and his brother, had accepted the criteria acknowledged by the early Companions of the Prophet for choosing the caliph, and were of the opinion that they, due to their relationship to the Prophet, were more qualified for the caliphate than anybody else. Al-Ḥusayn believed that Yazīd's caliphate would lead the Muslim community to depravity and that he, al-Ḥusayn, was more responsible than any other Muslim for preventing this moral corruption.

However, on what bases did Yazīd become caliph and how did he assume the caliphate while, among the Muslims, were the sons of the prominent Ṣaḥāba, such as al-Ḥusayn, Ibn al-Zubayr, Ibn ᶜUmar and Ibn Abī Bakr, who were more qualified for the caliphate than he? We have seen that except for the people of Syria-who were the real supporters of Muᶜāwiya-the people refused to recognize Yazīd. Even the close associates

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of Mu^{c}āwiya and some of his supporters, such as Ziyād and Marwān, were opposed to his accession.[1] Mu^{c}āwiya was not unaware of Yazīd's misconduct and his lack of qualifications for the caliphate. Nonetheless, he nominated him as his successor and imposed his caliphate on the people. Wanting to remove the real meaning of the caliphate and intending to transform it to a kingship (*mulk*) inherited among his offspring, Mu^{c}āwiya himself rejected the principle of the early Companions of the Prophet by choosing the caliph, as he articulated clearly in his letter to al-Ḥasan.[2]

The most important and effective measure utilized by Mu^{c}āwiya was the imposition of Yazīd's *bay^{c}a* on the people. In fact, it was the only way to secure Yazīd's caliphate. Once the people had sworn allegiance to Yazīd, they had no chance to revoke it. The most important cities for Mu^{c}āwiya to secure the *bay^{c}a* for Yazīd were Medina and Mecca (al-Ḥaramayn), since many of the sons of the prominent Ṣaḥāba were living there. With his Syrian troops and using threats, Mu^{c}āwiya, before his death, succeeded in securing the *bay^{c}a* for Yazīd from the people of the two cities.[3]

Meanwhile, the people of Kūfa continued to call al-Ḥusayn to rise against Mu^{c}āwiya, but al-Ḥusayn, honoring al-Ḥasan's truce with Mu^{c}āwiya, asked them to wait until the latter's death. Receiving the news of al-Ḥusayn's meetings with the Kūfan delegation at Mecca, Mu^{c}āwiya became more aware that al-Ḥusayn would not recognize Yazīd, that he would comply with the Kufans' appeal and, consequently, would rise against Yazīd. Due to al-Ḥusayn's leading position among the Muslims, especially in Mecca, Medina and

[1] According to al-Isfahānī, when Mu^{c}āwiya imposed the *bay^{c}a* for Yazīd, the prominent Umayyads in Medina, Marwān, Sa^{c}īd Ibn al-Āṣ and ^{c}Abd Allāh Ibn ^{c}Āmir expressed their disapproval of Yazīd's accession. *Al-Aghānī*, 18: 71.
[2] Al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil*, pp.66-7. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, 3: 280.
[3] Ibn A^{c}tham, *Futūḥ*, p. 2: 351-2. Khalīfa, *Ta'rīkh*, p. 164. Ibn Qutayba, *al-Imāma*, 1: 190.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Kūfa,[4] and his relationship to the Prophet, Mu^{c}āwiya realized that al-Ḥusayn's assassination would result in hazardous consequences for Yazīd's caliphate. Therefore, Mu^{c}āwiya, in his will, advised Yazīd not to cause any harm to al-Ḥusayn if he rose against him.

However, as soon as he assumed the caliphate, Yazīd wasted no time in asking al-Ḥusayn to pay homage to him. He gave al-Ḥusayn no alternative but to submit to his demand, ordering his governor of Medina to take allegiance from al-Ḥusayn. Because of the Umayyad officials' harassment, al-Ḥusayn decided to leave Medina, declaring that he would never recognize Yazīd. As soon as the Kūfans received news of al-Ḥusayn's refusal to give *bay^{c}a* and his departure from Medina, they started sending letters and delegations, calling him to lead them against the Umayyads.

Thus far, we have been dealing with what came before al-Ḥusayn's uprising. Our second finding has to do with why al-Ḥusayn actually revolted. There were four reasons for his revolt; first, his refusal to acknowledge Yazīd's caliphate. According to al-Ya^{c}qūbī, Yazīd ordered al-Walīd to behead al-Ḥusayn in the event that he declined to comply.[5] According to another account, al-Ḥusayn also declared that he had decided to leave Mecca because of the Umayyad threat. Upon asking him the reason for leaving Mecca, the most protected place for Muslims, al-Ḥusayn confirmed that the Umayyad officials were plotting to assassinate him there and that he wanted to protect the sanctity of the place. On many occasions, al-Ḥusayn also announced that the Umayyad authorities would not leave him alone unless he gave the *bay^{c}a* to Yazīd. When Ibn ^{c}Umar told al-

[4] Al-Ḥusayn's leading position was acknowledged by Ibn al-Zubayr himself. When al-Ḥusayn decided to leave Mecca, Ibn al-Zubayr told him that if he stayed in Mecca and assumed the caliphate, all the people would pay homage to him and that nobody would argue against his entitlement to the caliphate. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 375. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 289.
[5] Al-Ya^{c}qūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 241.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Ḥusayn that no harm would reach him if he stayed in his home, even without paying homage to Yazīd, al-Ḥusayn dismissed this claim.[6]

With Yazīd's caliphate, Muᶜāwiya had created a new system in regard to the caliphate, destroying the principles acknowledged by the early Companions of the Prophet and wishing to transform it into a kingship for his family.[7] Through his refusal to recognize Yazīd's caliphate, al-Ḥusayn intended to stand against this new system, which required no qualifications for the caliph, and to revive the principles of the early Companions of the Prophet.

The second reason for al-Ḥusayn's uprising was the Kūfans' frequent calls to lead them against the Umayyad officials. Al-Ḥusayn received many warnings from prominent persons about the fickleness of the Kūfans. Fearing that al-Ḥusayn might be killed at the hands of the Umayyad officials, Ibn ᶜAbbās and Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya suggested he to go to Yemen or to any other place where he could find many supporters and where he would be safer. Although al-Ḥusayn was not unaware of the Kūfans' attitude, he decided to pursue his plan. He believed that their *bayᶜa* was binding on him and that, therefore, it was his duty to comply with their call.

Unlike the Kūfans, neither the people of Yemen nor of Baṣra requested that al-Ḥusayn rise against the Umayyads. As for Yemen, al-Ḥusayn did not even send any letter or any envoy asking for support. This leaves us in doubt of there being any supporters in Yemen. Unlike the supporters of al-Ḥusayn in Kūfa who had full control over their city before Ibn Ziyād's arrival, Baṣra was under the control of Ibn Ziyād; the supporters of al-Ḥusayn had lost their power there because of Ibn Ziyād's brutality against opponents of

[6] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4:289. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 375. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 72, 79.
[7] According to Ibn Aᶜtham, the Syrians gave homage to Yazīd as the new caliph, and his son, Muᶜāwiya, as his successor. *Futūḥ*, 3: 7-8.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the Umayyads. Furthermore, al-Ḥusayn's envoy to Baṣra was handed over to Ibn Ziyād by one of the nobles from whom al-Ḥusayn had asked for support.[8] Therefore, the people of Kūfa were the strongest supporters of al-Ḥusayn and Kūfa was the only place for him to rise against the Umayyads.

A third factor could be added to the reasons for al-Ḥusayn's uprising; namely, the economic factor. For example, Ziyād Ibn Abīh deprived the followers of ᶜAlī from their share of the booty in reign of Muᶜāwiya. He did this in order to silence the party that was opposing the Umayyads. And that was one of Ḥujr's objections to Ziyād. The same procedure was taken by Ibn Ziyād against the followers of al-Ḥusayn. He tried to keep them from following al-Ḥusayn by threatening to take their property and withhold their shares from the treasury.

In one of their letters to al-Ḥusayn, the people of Kūfa condemned Muᶜāwiya for his unjust conduct in killing the best men of the community and for dividing the property of the community among the tyrants and wealthy men. They invited al-Ḥusayn to guide and unite them. They repeated their demand that he lead them in order to establish justice and remove corruption caused by Yazīd.[9] Al-Ḥusayn's objection to the Umayyads unjust treatment of ᶜAlī's supporters in Kūfa can be seen in his statement:

> Indeed, these authorities [the Umayyads] have adhered to obedience to Satan and have abandoned the Merciful; they have made corruption visible; they neglect the punishment (*ḥudūd*) laid down by God; *they have seized the booty (fay') exclusively for themselves*(italic is mine); they have permitted what God has forbidden, and they have forbidden what He has permitted. I am more responsible for changing this than anyone else.[10]

---

[8] Ibid., 4: 366. Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 232. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 43.
[9] Ibid., 3: 31-2. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 369. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 261-2. Al-Yaᶜqūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, 2: 241-2. Al-Masᶜūdī, *Murūj*, 3: 45.
[10] Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 304-5. Al-Ṭabarī, The Caliphate of Yazīd, *The History of al-Ṭabarī*, XIX, pp. 95-6. Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 91. Al-Balādhurī mentions this statement briefly. *Ansāb*, 3: 381

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Therefore, al-Husayn's uprising was also motivated by his desire to give the people back their economic rights and benefits.

The fourth and most important reason for the uprising was proclaimed by al-Ḥusayn himself. Before leaving Medina, al-Ḥusayn wanted to make an announcement about the reasons for his decision. He stated:

> I have not left my residence out of joy, or gratitude, or corruption, or wrongdoing; rather, I have left to seek reform (*iṣlāḥ*) in the community of my grandfather Muḥammad. I want to command morality (*maᶜrūf*) and to forbid corruption (*munkar*) and to follow the conduct (*sīra*) of my grandfather, my father and the rightly Guided Caliphs.[11]

Yazīd's caliphate, in al-Ḥusayn's eyes, was a deviation from the Sunna of the Prophet and the conduct of the Rightly Guided Caliphs, and represented corruption in the community of his grandfather. He announced that the reason for his refusal to recognize Yazīd and for his revolt was to prevent this corruption and to establish justice in the community. Because of Yazīd's irreligious conduct, al-Ḥusayn was not ready to lend legitimacy to his caliphate by paying homage to him.

Al-Ḥusayn did not listen to those who advised him to submit to the established authority (de facto) and to enter into whatever the community had entered into and agreed upon. They were fully aware of Yazīd's unsuitability for the caliphate and had opposed Muᶜāwiya's desire to nominate Yazīd as his successor. But, when the *bayᶜa* to Yazīd was imposed on them, they asked al-Ḥusayn to compromise and to follow the community (*al-jamāᶜa*). They believed that paying homage to Yazīd would be better than an uprising which might lead to the division of the community. Al-Ḥusayn rejected their advice to submit, even if

[11] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 23.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

it was agreed upon by most of the Muslims, explaining that their obligation was not to accept an unjust ruler who allows tyranny and aggression but to rise against him. For this reason, al-Ḥusayn told Ibn ᶜUmar, the pioneer of this opinion, that his duty was to support him against the illegitimate caliph.[12]

Even when he received the news of the killing of his envoys and the failure of the Kūfans to defend Ibn ᶜAqīl and learned that their swords had turned against him, al-Ḥusayn did not change his plan and continued his journey to Kūfa. On many occasions, al-Ḥusayn told those who had written to him that he came to Kūfa only because of their appeal, asking them to fulfill their promises. When he became convinced of their failure to stand with him, he asked them to allow him to go back to Medina or to any other place. Did al-Ḥusayn prepare to withdraw from his duty to rise against Yazīd and decide instead to recognize Yazīd? If so, why did al-Ḥusayn take his family with him and expose them to jeopardy?

Let us remember that, according to some sources, Shamir Ibn Dhī al-Jawshan, one of ᶜAlī's supporters who had turned against him and become one of the leaders of Ibn Ziyād's troops, advised Ibn Ziyād not to allow al-Ḥusayn to go anywhere, explaining that he would not withdraw from his plan and that he would call his supporters to stand with him against the Umayyads. Ibn Ziyād did not hesitate to accept Shamir's advice.[13] Al-Ḥusayn's continued defiance to acknowledging Yazīd's caliphate is also illustrated by his refusal of the governor of Medina's request-according to Yazīd's instruction-to give the *bayᶜa* to Yazīd.

---

[12] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 29.
[13] Al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, 4: 313-4. Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal al-Ḥusayn*, p. 69.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The final finding that we wish to highlight has to do with the role of al-Ḥusayn's family. When al-Ḥusayn refused to pay homage to Yazīd and was harassed by the Umayyad officials, he decided to leave his residence in Medina. Upon leaving Medina, al-Ḥusayn took his family with him. Apparently, there was no danger to them. None of his family were bothered by the Umayyad officials and, according to our sources, there was no intention on the part of the Umayyad officials to force al-Ḥusayn, through his family, to submit to Yazīd's demand. Therefore, there was actually no reason for al-Ḥusayn to take his family with him.

But he did take his family with him when he decided to comply with the Kūfans' call. When asked by Ibn ᶜAbbās about this, al-Ḥusayn did not disclose his intentions. Fearing that al-Ḥusayn would be killed just like ᶜUthmān, who was killed while his womenfolk and children were watching, Ibn ᶜAbbās advised al-Ḥusayn not to expose them to this jeopardy. Although al-Ḥusayn did not deny Ibn ᶜAbbās' statement, he told him that he had made his decision.[14] This leaves us in no doubt that al-Ḥusayn was aware of the dangerous fate that his family might face, especially when we remember that he was fully aware of the wavering attitude of the Kūfans and the probability of betrayal.

Even when al-Ḥusayn had received the news of the killing of Ibn ᶜAqīl and his other envoys in Kūfa and the Kūfans' failure to keep their commitments, and aware that a confrontation with the Umayyads was unavoidable, he did not send his family back to Medina. This leaves us with the impression that this decision was a part of his strategy and uprising so that they would play a significant role after his death in blaming the Kūfans for their failure to stand with him, and in agitating the masses against the

[14] Ibid., 3: 73-4. Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, p. 60. Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, 4: 288. Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 3: 374.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Umayyads for their treatment of the family of the Prophet. The role of his family was to testify to the ongoing illegitimacy of Yazīd's caliphate after the death of al-Ḥusayn and also to clarify the circumstances of his death for the people.

Although we admit that the details of al-Ḥusayn's uprising may be subject to some ambiguities, we have nevertheless uncovered several important factors that can help us to understand this event. Namely, we see that his uprising is first of all related to Muᶜāwiya's caliphate and his transformation of that institution for the sake of his son Yazīd. Al-Ḥusayn could not approve these changes and therefore refused to give the *bayᶜa* to Yazīd and also felt obliged to revolt against Yazīd and his unjust rule. Yazīd naturally had to eliminate al-Ḥusayn as a rival and arranged to have his revolt suppressed. Although, al-Ḥusayn died because of his resistance to Yazīd, he left his family to remind the people that the true caliphate had been destroyed and their Umayyad rulers were unjust.

I have tried to make an original contribution in this study by bringing up several points that western scholars[15] of the subject have neglected. First of all, I connected al-Ḥusayn's uprising to al-Ḥasan's abdication. None of the scholars have emphasized this. I argue that without al-Ḥasan's abdication, Muᶜāwiya would not have had full control over the Kūfans and without his father, Yazīd would not have become caliph. Furthermore, because of al-Ḥasan's abdication, the followers of ᶜAlī in Kūfa started to look to al-Ḥusayn as their leader and offered him their *bayᶜa*.

I also showed the importance of Ḥujr's protest, his execution and its relationship to al-Ḥusayn's uprising; I demonstrated that Ḥujr paved the way for al-Ḥusayn's uprising.

[15] I am referring to the studies of Wellhausen, Jafri, Vaglieri and Madelung.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

After his execution, the Kufans prepared to visit al-Ḥusayn and ask him to lead them against the Umayyads.

I have also made a point of discussing Muᶜāwiya's attempts and maneuvers for securing Yazīd's caliphate at length. Unlike Wellhausen, who believed that this matter was not recorded by the sources, and unlike other scholars who were oblivious to this matter, I paid due attention to this issue and discussed how Muᶜāwiya used different means to reach his goal.

Ibn Aqīl's mission and his failure are fully discussed in my study as well as in other works, but I have concentrated on the role of the leaders of the tribes and of Ibn Ziyād. Needless to say, Ibn Aqīl's mission affected al-Ḥusayn's plans to reach his followers in Kūfa. Because of Ibn Aqīl's failure and his execution, al-Ḥusayn could not reach Kūfa and, consequently, was killed.

Finally, I also wanted to discuss the aftermath of al-Ḥusayn's death in my study. The role of the captives has been neglected by other scholars.[16] The captives not only changed the attitudes of the Kūfans about al-Ḥusayn and the Umayyads to the extant that they began to oppose the Umayyads openly, but they also changed the attitude of Yazīd himself about al-Ḥusayn's murder. This last point is very important because at first, Yazīd was satisfied with Ibn Ziyād, but because of the captives and their agitating the masses, he condemned Ibn Ziyād and cursed him, although he later rewarded him and did not deprive him of his office.

As far as our sources are concerned, some issues need to be clarified. First of all, we should highlight the fact that all our sources are basically in agreement about the events

[16] Jafri mentions the events of the captives return briefly but he does not discuss their role. *Origins*, pp. 193-4.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of al-Ḥusayn's uprising and his death. Regardless of their intentions or whether they are classified as pro-Shīᶜī or pro-Sunnī, they all acknowledge the incident of al-Ḥusayn's killing; its beginning and its end.

Second, it should be clarified that a full account of this event was first recorded by Abū Mikhnaf and that al-Ṭabarī is the only historian who provides us with his version. Although Ibn Aᶜtham, al-Balādhurī and al-Dīnawarī deal with al-Ḥusayn in detail, they do not give a full account of the events; other sources only look at some aspects of al-Ḥusayn's killing or provide mere segments of the events. This is why al-Ṭabarī takes more space than other sources.

However, three patterns of writing can be distinguished in our sources. First, that of al-Ṭabarī, who does not provide his own comments or interpretations of the events. He usually provides several different accounts of the same event without commenting on them; he leaves the reader to make his own judgment or analysis. He did not provide his own comments and omitted at least some of his reports fearing that they would be rejected by the public, as he himself mentions when he deals with Abū Dharr's deportation from Syria to Medina and in regard to ᶜUmān's murder,[17] or that he might be classified as pro-Shīᶜī. Al-Balādhurī could be classified in this category since he follows al-Ṭabarī's pattern.

The second patter belongs to Ibn Saᶜd, who presents Sunnī viewpoint in some of his reports with different *isnāds*. Although he agrees with other sources about the events and Yazīd's lack of qualifications for the caliphate, he recorded his own comments on al-Ḥusayn's revolt. He seems to agree with Ibn ᶜUmar and other prominent persons who

[17] Al-Tabarī, states, "Many things (*umūr*) were related concerning his (Abū Dharr) deportation, but I was reluctant (*karihnā*) to narrate most of them." *Ta'rīkh*, 3: 353. The same statement is uttered in regard to ᶜUthmān's murder. Ibid., p. 399.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

believed that al-Ḥusayn should have given *bayᶜa* to Yazīd and entered into whatever the Muslims agreed upon. He explains that if al-Ḥusayn would have paid homage to Yazīd, even though he was not qualified for the caliphate, this would have been better than dissension and revolt. Although he does not comment on this account, Ibn Saᶜd seems to be leaning to Ibn ᶜUmar's viewpoint that al-Ḥusayn was seeking to worldly power. He also seems to be of the opinion that Yazīd was not responsible of al-Ḥusayn's killing.[18]

A third pattern is to be found in Ibn Aᶜtham, who does not cite his authorities. Contrary to Ibn Saᶜd, Ibn Aᶜtham presents a Shīᶜī perspective and gives many exaggerated accounts about al-Ḥusayn's life and death. He defends al-Ḥusayn's decision to revolt against Yazīd and insists that the latter was responsible for his killing.[19]

Finally, my arguments have not been about the events of al-Ḥusayn's death itself because all the sources agree that it took place. My study is about interpreting the reasons for al-Ḥusayn's uprising, interpreting why he was killed, as well as the role of Muᶜāwiya in securing his son's caliphate and Yazīd's culpability for al-Ḥusayn's death.

[18] Ibn Saᶜd, *Maqtal*, pp. 57, 67-8, 81.
[19] Ibn Aᶜtham, *Futūḥ*, 3: 152-3.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Al-ᶜAlāylī, ᶜAbd Allāh. *Al-Imām al-Ḥusayn: Sumuw al-Maᶜnā fī Sumuw al-Dhāt*. Beirut: Dār Maktabat al-Tarbiya, 1989.

ᶜAlī, Jawād. "Mawārid al-Ṭabarī," *Majallat al-Majmaᶜ al-Ilmī al-ᶜIrāqī*. Baghdad: al-Majmaᶜ al-ᶜIlmī al-ᶜIrāqī, 1954.

Al-Amīn, Muḥsin. *Aᶜyān al-Shīᶜa*. 10 vols. Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1406/1986.

Al-ᶜAqqād, ᶜAbbās Maḥmūd. *Abul-Shuhadā': Al-Ḥusayn Ibn ᶜAlī*. Cairo: Dār al-Hilāl. n.d.

Attallah, W. "al-Kalbī," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*. New edition. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1990, v. 4.

Ayoub, Mahmoud. *Redemptive Suffering in Islam: A Study of the Devotional Aspects of ᶜĀshūrā' in Twelver Shīᶜism*. New York: Mouton, 1978.

Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm, Muḥammad Taqī. *Maqtal al-Ḥusayn*. Beirut: Dār al-Zahrā', 1405/1985.

Al-Balādhurī, Aḥmad Ibn Yaḥyā. *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*. 13 vols. Ed. Suhayl Zakkār and Riyāḍ Zarkalī, Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1417/1996.

Bayḍūn, Ibrāhīm. "Masā'il al-Manhaj fil-Kitāba al-Ta'rīkhiyya fī Nihāyat al-Qarn al-Thānī al-Hijrī," *al-Munṭalaq*. No. 43. Beirut: al-Ittiḥād al-Lubnānī lil- Ṭalaba al-Muslimīn, 1408/1988.

_____. *Thawrat al-Ḥusayn Ḥadathan wa-Ishkāliyyāt*. Beirut: Sharikat al-Maṭbuᶜāt lil-Tawzīᶜ wal-Nashr, 2001.

Becker, C.H. –[F. Rosenthal]. "Al-Balādhurī," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*. New edition. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960, v. 1.

Chelkowski, Peter. "Taᶜziyeh: Indigenous Avant-Garde Theater of Iran." In *Taᶜziyah Ritual and Drama in Iran*. Ed. by Peter J. Chelkowski, New York: New York University Press, 1979.

_____. "Rawza-Khawānī," *The Encyclopedia of Religion*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1987, v. 12.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

_____. "Taᶜziya," *The Encyclopedia of Religion.* New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1987, v. 14.

Daniel, Elton L. "Al-Yaᶜqūbī and Shiᶜism Reconsidered." In *ᶜAbbasid Studies: Occasional Papers of the School of ᶜAbbasid Studies.* Ed. James E. Montgomery, Leuven: Peeter, 2004.

Al-Dīnawarī, Aḥmad Ibn Dāwūd. *Al-Akhbār al-Ṭiwāl.* Ed. ᶜAbd al-Munᶜim ᶜĀmir, Qum: Maṭbaᶜat al-Amīr, 1408/1988.

Dixon, ᶜAbd al-Ameer. *The Umayyad Caliphate (65-86/684-705).* London: Luzac and Company, 1971.

Donaldson, Dwight, M. *The Shiᶜite Religion.* London: Luzac and Company, 1993.

Al-Dūrī, A. A. *The Rise of Historical Writing Among the Arabs.* Ed. and tr. by Lawrence I. Conrad, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.

El-Ali, Saleh. "ᶜAwāna b. al-Ḥakam al-Kalbī," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam.* New edition. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960, v. 1.

El-Ali, Saleh and Cl. Cahen. "ᶜArīf," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam.* New edition. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960, v. 1.

Fück, J. W. "Ibn Saᶜd," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam.* New edition. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971, v. 3.

Gibb, H. A. R. "*Ta'rīkh,*" In *Studies on the Civilization of Islam.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962.

_____. "Abū Mikhnaf," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam.* New edition. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960, v.1.

Al-Ḥasanī, Hāshim Maᶜrūf. *Sīrat al-A'imma al-Ithnay ᶜAshar.* 2 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Taᶜāruf, 1409/1989.

Hawting, G.R. "Yazīd (I) B. Muᶜāwiya," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam.* New edition. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2002, v. 11.

Al-Ḥaydarī, Ibrāhīm. *Trājīdyā Karbalā'.* Beirut: Dār al-Ṣāqī, 1999.

Howard, I. K. A. "Ḥusayn Ibn ᶜAlī," *The Encyclopedia of Religion.* New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1987, v. 6.

Humphreys, Stephen. *Islamic History: A Framework for Inquiry.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd, ᶜIzz al-Dīn. *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāgha.* 20 vols. Cairo: Dār Iḥyā' al-Kutub al-ᶜArabiyya, 1965.

Ibn Abī Yaᶜqūb, Aḥmad. *Ta'rīkh al-Yaᶜqūbī.* 2 vols. Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, n.d.

Ibn Aᶜtham al-Kūfī, Aḥmad. *Kitāb al-Futūḥ.* 4 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ᶜIlmiyya, 1408/1986

Ibn Khallikān, Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad. *Wafayāt al-Aᶜyān wa-Anbā' Abnā' al-Zamān.* 8 vols. Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1397/1977.

Ibn Khayyāṭ, Khalīfa. *Ta'rīkh Khalīfa Ibn Khayyāṭ.* Ed. Suhayl Zakkār, Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1414/1993.

Ibn Qutayba, ᶜAbd Allāh Ibn Muslim. *Al-Imāma wal-Siyāsa.* 2 vols. Cairo: Maktaba wa-Maṭbaᶜat Muṣṭafā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī wa-Awlādih, 1388/1993.

Ibn Saᶜd, Abū ᶜAbd Allāh Muḥammad. *Tarjamat al-Imām al-Ḥusayn wa-Maqtaluh min al-Qism Ghayr al-Maṭbūᶜ min Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā.* Ed. ᶜAbd al-ᶜAzīz al-Ṭabāṭabā'ī, Qum: Mu'assasat Āl al-Bayt li-Iḥyā' al-Turāth, 1416/1996.

_____. *Tarjamat al-Imām al-Ḥasan min al-Qism Ghayr al-Maṭbūᶜ min Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā.* Ed. ᶜAbd al-ᶜAzīz al-Ṭabāṭabā'ī, Qum: Mu'assasat Āl al-Bayt li-Iḥyā' al-Turāth, 1416/1996.

Al-Isfahānī, Abul-Faraj. *Maqātil al-Ṭālibiyyīn.* Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Aᶜlamī, 1407/1987.

_____. *Al-Aghānī.* 25 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ᶜIlmiyya, 1406/1986.

Jafri, S. Husain. *Origins and Early Development of Shīᶜa Islam.* London: Longman Group Ltd., 1979.

Al-Jubūrī, Kāmil Salmān. *Nuṣūṣ min Ta'rikh Abū Mikhnaf* . 2 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Maḥajja al-Bayḍā', 1999.

Kāshif al-Ghiṭā', Muḥammad Ḥusayn. *Maqtal al-Ḥusayn.* Ed. Hādī al-Jalālī, Qum: Manshūrāt al-Sharīf al-Raḍī. 1419/1998.

Khawārizm, Akhṭab. *Maqtal al-Ḥusayn.* 2 vols. Qum: Maktabat al-Mufīd, n. d.

Al-Kirbāsī, Muḥammad Sādiq. *Dā'irat al-Maᶜārif al-Ḥusayniyya.* 47 vols. London: Al-Markaz al-Ḥusaynī lil-Dirāsāt, 1408/1987.

Lammens, Henri. "Le Califat de Yazīd 1,ᵉʳ" *Mélanges de la Faculté Orientale.* London: Luzac and Co. 1910.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Madelung, Wilfred. *The Succession to Muḥammad: A Study of the Early Caliphate.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Al-Maḥmūdī, Muḥammad Bāqir. *ᶜAbarāt al-Muṣṭafayn fī Maqtal al-Ḥusayn.* 2 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Maḥajja al-Bayḍā', 1417/1997.

Al-Masᶜūdī, ᶜAlī Ibn Muḥammad. *Murūj al-Dhahab wa-Maᶜādin al-Jawhar.* 4 vols. Qum: Manshūrāt Dār al-Hijra, 1404/1984.

Milḥim, Adnān. *Al-Mu'arrikhūn al-ᶜArab wal-Fitna al-Kubrā.* Beirut: Dār al-Ṭalīᶜa, 1998.

Al-Mufīd, Muḥammad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Nuᶜmān. *Al-Irshād.* 2 vols. Qum: Mu'assasat Āl al-Bayt, 1413/1993.

Al-Muqarram, ᶜAbd al-Razzāq. *Maqtal al-Ḥusayn.* Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-Islāmī, 1399/1979.

Muṭahharī, Murtaḍā. *Al-Malḥama al-Ḥusayniyya.* 3 vols. Qum: al-Markaz al-ᶜĀlamī lil-Dirāsāt al-Islāmiyya, 1413/1992.

Nasr, Sayyed Hossein. "Shiism: Ithnā ᶜAsharīya," *The Encyclopedia of Religion.* New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1987, v. 13.

Peterson, Erling Landewig, *ᶜAlī and Muᶜāwiya In Early Arabic Tradition.* Tr. Lampe Christensen, Copenhagen: Scandinavian University Books, 1964.

Al-Qurashī, Bāqir Sharīf. *Ḥayāt al-Imām al-Ḥusayn.* 3 vols. Qum: Manshūrāt Madrasat al-Irawānī, 4th ed. 1413/1992.

Shaban, M. H. "Ibn Aᶜtham al- Kūfī," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam.* New edition. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971, v. 3.

Shams al-Dīn, Muḥammad Mahdī. *Thawrat al-Ḥusayn: Ẓurūfuhā al-Ijtimāᶜiyya wa-Āthāruhā al-Insāniyya.* Beirut: Dār al-Taᶜāruf, 1401/1981.

_____. *Thawrat al-Ḥusayn fil-Wijdān al-Shaᶜbī.* Beirut: al-Dār al-Islāmiyya, 1400/1980.

_____. *Niẓām al-Ḥukm wal-Idāra fil-Islām.* Qum: Dār al-Thaqāfa, 1412/1992.

Shoshan, Boaz. *Poetics of Islamic Historiography; Deconstructing Ṭabarī's History.* Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Al-Ṭabarī, Muḥammad Ibn Jarīr. *Ta'rīkh al-Umam wal-Mulūk.* 8 vols. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Aᶜlamī lil-Maṭbūᶜāt, 1403/1983.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

_____. The Caliphate of Mu^{c}āwiya. *The History of al-Ṭabarī* (*Ta'rīkh al-Rusul wal-Mulūk*). XVIII. Translated and annotated by Michael G. Morony, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1987.

_____. The Caliphate of Yazīd b. Mu^{c}āwiya. *The History of al-Ṭabarī* (*Ta'rīkh al-Rusul wal-Mulūk*). XIX. Translated and annotated by I. K. Howard, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990.

Al-Ṭabāṭabā'ī, Muḥammad Ḥusayn. *Shi^{c}ite Islam*. Tr. by Hossein Nasr, Albany: University of New York, 1975.

Tyan E. "Bay^{c}a," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*. New edition. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971, v.1.

Vaglieri, L. Veccia. "al-Ḥasan B. ^{c}Alī B. Abī Ṭālib," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*. New edition. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971, v. 3.

_____. "al-Ḥusayn B. ^{c}Alī B. Abī Ṭālib," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*. New edition. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971, v. 3.

Wellhausen, Julius. *Al-Dawla al-^{c}Arabiyya wa-Ṣuqūṭuhā* (*Das Arabische Reich und sein Sturz*). Tr. Muḥammad ^{c}Abd al-Hādī, Cairo: lujnat al-Ta'līf wal-Tarjama wal-Nashr, 1986.

_____. *Al-Shī^{c}a wal-Khawārij* (*Die religiös-politischen Oppositions Parteien im alten Islam*). Tr. ^{c}Abd al-Raḥmān Badawī, Kuwait: Wakālat al-Maṭbū^{c}āt, 1976.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.